Oneirosophy

Triumphant George

Oneirosophy

by Triumphant George

«**Just *decide*.**

Decide to be totally relaxed. Decide to feel calm. Decide to win at the game. Decide to meet that person you've dreamed of. Decide to be rich. **Decide to triumph.**

Because in this subjective idealistic reality, where the dream is you, what else is there to do?»

ONEIROSOPHY

oneiro-: From Ancient Greek ὄνειρος (*óneiros*, "**dream**").

-**sophy**: From the Latin *sophia*, from the Ancient Greek σοφῐ́ᾱ (*sophíā*, "high knowledge": "learning", "**wisdom**"); compare *Sophia*.

Oneirosophy means "dream wisdom"

The foundations of Oneirosophy are:

Lucidity - A state similar to gnosis or satori where one regains consciousness of the illusory nature of waking reality, just as one becomes lucid in a dream.

Idealism - All of waking reality is a mental structure, a *dreamed reality*.

Matter is an idea in the mind.

Foreword [by mrtdythnystrdy]

“What does a dream look like from the outside?”

Not sure if an insight per se, but some visualization of what a dream looks like from the outside; outside of space-time (or the illusion of it). So we have this mind/imagination, with infinite potential. It is knowing itself (knowing = noun). **Wholeness.** Love/peace/joy/happiness are expressions of it, as they are expressions of wholeness (think about it - love/peace/joy/happiness are not expressions of lack).

So, **we've got this knowing/mind/Presence that exists nowhere, no place, no time.** It has no dimensions; it's just an abstract massless/dimensionless/infinite/indivisible presence. Where, place, and time, appear in it (but those are concepts anyway). Everything appearing at all appears within it. (Thoughts are appearances, too.) It is nameless, yet we name it God. (Yet again, by naming it, we objectify it; imply it external to ourselves/This.)

And this presence has a dream. Infinite potential; it can dream itself as anything; the dream can take any possible shape/form.

So any awareness - of anything - any consciousness - is That dreaming. Yet, as in any dream, the dreamer is the entirety of it; there is no part that is not the dreamer. But, since the dreamer is the entirety of it, whatever they conclude is true (if the dreamer has dreamt up the ability to "conclude truth") will appear as true. Time can only be an illusion, space can only be an illusion, distance, difficulty, identity, et al: every single piece of the dream is an illusion. The dreamer - consciousness - is unlimited.

That means - any method to "do" anything is a placebo. Any belief is arbitrary. Beliefs about belief are arbitrary. Beliefs are concepts within the dream, nothing more. They give structure to that which has no structure. Everything is happening - automatically - to reflect the world that exists "within the mind" of the dreamer. What they know.

If one thinks they need to figure out "how," they have the experience/thoughts of that. If they think they don't, they have the experience of that. If they think they're being blocked, they are. If they don't, they aren't. If they believe external forces have an impact, they do. If they don't, they don't. If they think something about "another person," it seems/appears true. If they think something else, that seems/appears true. If they think their health/healing is based on external factors, it appears that way. If they believe their health is a given / divine right, it is. If they think they are forgetful, they seem forgetful. If they think they have a good memory, they have a good memory. If their joy or happiness is conditional on some external experience or object being received, it is. If they think it's not, it's not. If we think we have to imagine perfectly to achieve xyz, then we do. If we don't, we don't. If we think the past is fixed and can't be changed, it appears that way. If we don't, it is changeable. If we believe what we read or hear, then what we read or hear seems true; is experienced as true. If we don't believe what we read or hear, then it doesn't. If we think we're royal, we are. If we think we're not, we're not. If we think things should be delivered with a red carpet on a silver platter, they will be. If we think that's impossible and we need to go get them, it will be like that.

"Out there" is a reflection, because it reflects what's going on "in here." What I have "in here" - of which only I am the cause - appears "out there." Whatever I want in here - I appear not to have out there. Although, in truth there is no "out there;" it is all within Me; it is all Me; My projection/reflection. (If the definition of "I" is

mistakenly associated with the body/identity, then this will seem difficult to reconcile. But **"I" Am Everything; My Imagination.**)

And if the dreamer - God/Presence - dreams a dream where they aren't aware of their true identity as the dreamer (i.e. they enter the dream blank, are conditioned, then identify with what they've been told they are / the dream is), then they're asleep to the fact of dreaming. And all the evidence will be provided in terms of experience and thoughts, because they can only experience their concept of themselves / of "what is" - according to them. The contents of their consciousness.

And just like a dream at night, by not knowing it's a dream (for whatever reason), the consciousness dreaming the dream listens to the dream as if it's true. Even though they're never Knowing anything other than themselves at that moment. They have the experience of seeking in the world they unknowingly create - a world that is them - based on rules that they are making up, that are self-reinforcing if they don't know it.

The very activity of dreaming itself is imagining. Although it is a "direct imagining," where the imagined becomes experienced. This - "You" "reading this" - right now - Is Imagining. You are imagining yourself as a human, with a past, in a body, in the year 2022, on a planet called Earth, reading words in English on a screen (and all the other details/thoughts being experienced this moment). All of This Is Your imagination. Although not in the way that is "colloquially defined." The "human definition" of imagining is creating essentially pictures or scenarios in the mind that aren't "real," or only experienced mentally, not physically. So that would almost be like "pretend imagining." Imagining without the belief that the imagining is anything, or has an effect on anything.

In a dream, the dream is being dreamt; imagined, somehow. And, when becoming lucid, the dream becomes responsive to the thoughts/imagination of the dreamer. Suddenly, the thoughts/imagination of the dream are intuitively understood to be on the same level as the dream itself - even though they were the entire time anyway. Not differing levels, as is commonly thought of in 'this world.' When becoming lucid, all meaning and sense of separation from the dream content evaporates. So, the prior thought content (believed [imagined] character, separation, other people, situations, environment) no longer has validity, meaning, substance, or history, because it was based on false premises. It no longer arises.

"This world" is "taking place" inside of Me, as Me. Just like in a dream; the dream takes place inside the dreamer, even though it looks the opposite. And like a dream, different materials feel different; there are liquids, there are solids, there is air if you think there is. Yet, all of those sensations are just dream-stuff. Vibrations, if you want to call them that.

As the dreamer, there is no "how." Even in a night-time dream, as the dream avatar/character, they don't experience the entirety of everything via their senses; their view is limited. Yet, their imagination is not. Whatever is considered "done" in imagination is done/experienced physically. "How" it's done is a question only an asleep dreamer (i.e. not realizing they're dreaming) would think they need an answer to. "Because I, the dreamer, said so" is the how. The details, irrelevant, are automatically taken care of.

(To reiterate: the dreamer/imaginer isn't the character. We'll call the character "Bob." Bob cannot imagine. A fictional entity cannot do anything. The dreamer imagines a "Bob," and then imagines within the "Bob" framework. It's always the dreamer imagining, never Bob. The only limitations the dreamer can appear to have are the ones they believe Bob to have if they believe they are Bob.)

Imagining, in this sense, is just visiting another truly existing experience (existing because of infinite potential contained within the timeless indivisible eternal awareness that is Now). So if that experience isn't "present" now, it still is very much "real," just being visited or decided upon in mind (with as much or as little detail as preferred; it'll all be filled in regardless). This is actually how this experience is navigated anyway, even while non-lucid (notice how thoughts predict/anticipate. Those thoughts are imagination. They are imagining. Imagining happens "inside." The results? Outside). It's just that while unaware, there are rules that are believed that narrow the band of experience. Lucid, there are none.

So **My imagination and God's imagination are the same One. Indivisible.** But if God thinks His imagination is only the imagination of a limited, separated human in a world unaffected by it, then God gets to experience that!

It's progressive. It's a (wordy) take on Nonduality. There's only One (no) thing. It's consciousness, without limitation or boundary. Yet, consciousness can only look inward, as there is nothing outside of itself. So, if it experiences anything, it experiences ... itself. Its concept of itself. Yet, everything is only made of itself. One substance... itself.

All boundaries and separation are illusion. That means no depth (no here vs there), no past/future (Now vs then), no separation-based identity (no individual, only Consciousness, whole and complete). Take this as far as "you" can.

It's the realization that whatever appears as experience (thought, identity, body, world) is ultimately You, made of You, whatever you believe to be True - Is. However, all decisions / conclusions are made in one place. They aren't made 'outside' of you, there is no 'outside of you.' There is only you. So just like you make a decision to move your hand, the same "intender" that forms that intention moves the entire world, whether you realize it or not.

That is Who you are at your core. You are that big. There are no rules. No experience to go by as a metric. Getting used to the implications of this lets one take things less seriously. If it's just You (not little ego-human-idea you, but Unconditioned Unlimited You), then anything that happens is just like looking in the mirror. If you don't know it's a mirror, you can be shaken. If you know it's a mirror, you chuckle, you move on, you don't need to feed it or be scared. You know it's You, its yours. So you change your reflection, your self-concept, and as that changes, your world changes.

Like a dream. A dream at night, if you realize you're dreaming, you realize, hey I'm doing all of this! EVERYTHING is fake! The location, time, year, people, etc. - they're all my imagination! Yet, you maintain your egoic-identity. You just realize you're God of your dream.

Well, here's the thing. This is a dream, too. Except you're God. Full stop. Or awareness, or unlimited consciousness, or whatever you want to call it. When you awake from this dream, while still dreaming or not, you will realize how everything is fake - including your identity as a person/human - and it was just your imagination. The awareness that experiences All Of This is You.

So, if you can know that now, before the dream ends, how does your behavior change?

From experience level, decisions can be now 'made' about 'things' that *appear* external to body (because that boundary is imaginary - it doesn't exist) to steer them in preferred directions. Works internally as well; the art "I" "create" is magnitudes greater than before some of these realizations were made.

If anything, it gives you some simple logic as to why you can believe in yourself wholly and unconditionally, because You are All There Is. To know, despite any appearance, that things are All Good, and you are the ultimate Interpreter as well as the source. And besides, with that said, you're always "believing in your self" no matter what you believe in. Because it is all Your Self. It's more of a "oh, I don't have to believe in / give attention to 'that possible self' anymore." Because I am the source of All. All "selves," all experiences, all.

All the reasons that you ever held about why you "can't" go flying out the window, as they are just as imaginary as everything else.

Oneirosophy

The Model

What's it all about?

"It"

One of the most difficult things to grasp when it comes to "jumping" and its associated metaphors, is the change in the concept of what "you" are. Although this isn't *required* in order to make changes, it's probably the most helpful thing to get a handle on for both "jumping" and for just everyday living.

The summary of your situation is this:

- **What you truly are is an "open space of awareness" in which experiences arise.**
- The experience you are having of being a person in a world is really a *thought about* "being a person in a world".
- It just so happens that this is a very bright, immersive, multi-sensory 3D thought - and we confuse parts of this thought with who we really are, incorrectly.

Experiencing It

There are various methods which can help us to recognise it. What they all have in common is that you stop trying to *thinking about* this situation (that just creates more experiences) and instead *directly sense* the space around you and within you.

Meditation is one such method, however as mostly practiced it's a great "settling down" technique but relies upon chance for a glimpse of the background experience. Far better to pursue things directly. For this, we can pursue exploration of our direct experience, by attending to it and/or by choosing to alter it:

Application of the jumping techniques described here can be applied for experimenting with making changes to our experience. Attempting to directly create synchronicity via patterning is a quick way to prove to oneself that your personal world is more malleable and *basic* than you might have assumed.

Understanding It

Reading about theories from science and philosophy relating to "private world" ideas can help provide us with more grounded metaphors.

Reporting It

Another source of inspiration and knowledge can be unusual personal anecdotes - in the form of "glitch in the matrix" or "reality shift" stories, and reports of altered state or NDE experiences. An example of a description of being being open awareness, and a thought becoming immersive and becoming a dominant experience, is this account of meditation into pure awareness. Excerpts:

> *"The best way that I can describe it is that this state was beyond the need for thoughts or senses. Thoughts and senses are things that in my view pertain to consciousness. Where I was, it was a state of pure awareness-beyond consciousness and therefore the need of thoughts or senses."*

"It was ... like letting go of something that I was stuck to. It was as if I was a balloon that was tied down and then suddenly released to begin floating. Like I was carrying a heavy weight on my back that was finally lifted. This was the feeling right at the point of entry. What followed was the state that I could never fully describe in words."

"The experience was void and yet all encompassing at the same time. It was a state of demanifestation with the seeming power to remanifest should I choose to introduce thought. It was kind of like this; I wasn't thinking but if I did think, I would become what I was thinking. Therefore, I dared not think about anything because that would have meant that I would have manifested out of total awareness and bliss. Being in this state was beyond bliss, you want to stay there and not do anything to disturb it."

-- *Victor C Other 6247*, NDERF

Being It

This part is easy, because no matter what experience you *appear* to be having right now, you are still that open conscious space. **You cannot *not* be this.** You might take on the shape of this or that world, but like a pool of water that has become rippled, you are still that water. The added benefit you have over most puddles: **you are a pool with the power to ripple itself!**

Outside: The Dreaming Game

BACKGROUND: A description of an exercise I originally came up with elsewhere, but I think it could be useful to folk here too. In subjective reality, we would be both the player and the creator for the content.

Inside Outside: The Game

If everyday life were an apparently massive multiplayer video-game, then dreams would describe how the mechanics of such a game, which is called *Outside*, operate. You are not actually the character you play in *Outside*, rather you are an open "game-space" which connects to *Outside* and adopts a particular perspective in the *Outside* game environment. In periods of reduced activity, your "game-space" disconnects and either connects to another pre-existing game-world, or constructs one on its own, seeded by random data fluctuations. You can see this happening in the case of hypnogogia and fragmentary imagery.

Generally these worlds are more flexible than *Outside*, because to save on processor and memory power, all games function on a co-creation, procedural expectation/recall-based engine - so the more players there are, the more stable a game world becomes. Because *Outside* is the main, default subscription for all current players there (part of the terms and conditions), you always reconnect to *Outside* whenever other connections collapse.

Outside Inside: An Exercise

You can prove this to yourself by trying to observe the disconnection/reconnection in progress, or **illustrate it via a thought experiment, to be done '1st person', as if you are having the experience:**

- Sit comfortably. Now imagine turning off your senses one by one:
- Turn off vision. Are you still there?
- Turn off sound. Still there?
- Turn off bodily sensations, such as the feeling of the chair beneath you. Uh-huh?
- Turn off thoughts. Where/what are you now?
- Some people are left with a fuzzy sense of being "located". This is just a residual thought. Turn that off too.

You're still there, you realise; you are a wide-open "aware space" in which those other experiences appeared. *Outside* is the generator of those experiences, including the body and many of the spontaneous thoughts and actions. Only a subset of change: *intentional* change, is actually your influence. The rest is just part of the game experience. There are rumours of players who have developed limited, dev-like "magickal" powers based on "intentional" procedures, but since these would also produce a revised game narrative to cover their tracks - 'narrative/experiential coherence' is enforced religiously by the game engine - this is hard to confirm. When you eventually complete *Outside*, after the final montage sequence, the connection is terminated and the 'world' within you disappears - followed by your next adventure, should you choose to accept it!

[...]

If you read this **please do try the experiment**, just reading about it or thinking about it doesn't have the effect. Coupled with the *Just Decide* exercise I posted a while back, it can be quite powerful.

> A1: Intention is just the preprocessor for rendering

In a game-world defined by belief, expectation and accumulated knowledge.

> Q1: [In periods of reduced activity, your "game-space" disconnects and either connects to another pre-existing game-world]; Is that pre-existing game-world another person's dream? Or a realm that multiple dreamers visit? Or none of the above?

That multiple dreamers visit, that was perhaps seeded by a single person at one point, but other came to occupy. Sometimes you might find yourself being a pre-existing character, looking through their "viewport", sometimes you might just appear as "yourself". Sometimes you might accidentally find yourself in a world like this, with a complete history, and be the only visitor with knowledge. Depends on the nature and flexibility of the environment. All worlds persist to some extent after creation, although they may gradually fall apart through lack of intention/expectation.

The Hall of Records

I posted this as a comment before, but figured I would post it properly since although similar to the Infinite Grid metaphor, it's quite a nice in that it doesn't need too much background. It didn't occur to me until just now, but the idea is similar to the Akashic records. That entry even uses the phrase "Hall of Records", although differently. But then, eternalism is quite an old idea really.

The Hall of Records

Imagine that you are a conscious being exploring a Hall of Records for this world. You are connecting to a vast memory bank containing all the possible events, from all the possible perspectives, that might have happened in a world *like this*. Like navigating through an experiential library. Each "experience" is a 3D sensory moment, from the perspective of being-a-person, in a particular situation. And there may be any number of customers perusing the records. So this is not solipsism: Time being meaningless in such a structure, we might say that "eventually" all records will be looked-through, and so there is always consciousness experiencing the other perspectives in a scene.

At the same time, this allows for a complex world-sharing model where influence is permitted, because "influencing events" simply means navigating from one 3D sensory record to another, in alignment with one's intention. This process of navigation could be called *remembering*. Practically, this would involve summoning part of a record in consciousness and having it *auto-complete* by association. This would be called *recall*. You can observe something like this "patterned unfolding" occurring in your direct conscious experience right now. So in terms of "dimensional jumping" you don't need to worry about another "you". You are not even the person you are experiencing, you are simply looking at this particular series of event-memories, from this particular perspective. "Jumping" means to decide to recall a memory that is not directly connected to this one.

If you are feeling adventurous you might also check out my post elsewhere on *The Patterning of Experience*.

Note that none of this metaphorical stuff is necessarily required though - all that matters is that you are willing to let go of the current experience, and believe that you can connect to another experience which is discontinuous with it. However, these "Active Metaphors" better allow you to format yourself.

I do like the idea that we might one day develop a *Library Guide for Researchers* which would help us all navigate this stuff more easily.

[...]

You don't do anything. You simply *recall* it - trigger the pattern. You don't do anything physically, you don't have to overcome anything. If you relax completely then *allow* the imagery to arise. Having triggered that pattern, it persists.

The good thing is, solipsism or not doesn't change the model. If you *like* to think that other consciousnesses are browsing the records, you can do so. If you do, then how you plan on differentiating "consciousness" from "consciousness" is then your own business. :-)

We could say that it avoids the *requirement* for "direct solipsism". How do your own beliefs differ? And: what do they mean for your life practically?

The background awareness of your experience right now *is* that consciousness, *is* that "God", and *is* what "you" really are. Right now. Not abstractly. And the memory-block is dissolved into the background of that awareness; all possibilities are right here in this room.

> Q: Have you got published evidence to back that up?

Published evidence to back up the fact that *you* can't fly amongst the clouds??

Mythical store of all that was, will be, ever is, in action, deed or emotion - in aetheric form. Supposedly.

> “I see myself as a tiny dot out of my physical body, which lies inert before me. I find myself oppressed by darkness and there is a feeling of terrific loneliness. Suddenly, I am conscious of a white beam of light. As this tiny dot, I move upward following the light, knowing that I must follow it or be lost.”
>
> “As I move along this path of light I gradually become conscious of various levels upon which there is movement. Upon the first levels there are vague, horrible shapes, grotesque forms such as one sees in nightmares. Passing on, there begin to appear on either side misshapen forms of human beings with some part of the body magnified. Again there is change and I become conscious of gray-hooded forms moving downward. Gradually, these become lighter in color. Then the direction changes and these forms move upward and the color of the robes grows rapidly lighter. Next, there begin to appear on either side vague outlines of houses, walls, trees, etc., but everything is motionless. As I pass on, there is more light and movement in what appear to be normal cities and towns. With the growth of movement I become conscious of sounds, at first indistinct rumblings, then music, laughter, and singing of birds. There is more and more light, the colors become very beautiful, and there is the sound of wonderful music. The houses are left behind, ahead there is only a blending of sound and color. Quite suddenly I come upon a hall of records. It is a hall without walls, without ceiling, but I am conscious of seeing an old man who hands me a large book, a record of the individual for whom I seek information.”
>
> -- Edgar Cayce, Christian Mystic

[...]

Whereas NLP was playing around the edges of "how you conceive of things affects your response to them" - it never had an underlying philosophy of the world at large - the "jumping" thing is more a case of leveraging philosophical idealism.

It's only a step away from "magick" I'd say, but also nearer to its essence.

I say: **there is no subconscious. It's just the parts of the world you aren't looking at right now. All intention affects a part of this world *directly* and the effects are seen from that point on.**

The only difference between approaches (of any sort) for creating change is the world-metaphor (including the what-you-are metaphor). The world-model you've committed to limits what you will observe happening - so to make massive change, you need to alter that or put it temporarily offline, or a halfway version between the two.

The World-Model

> Q: Could you expand a bit on what you mean by the world-model?

The "world-model" would be how you think things are "behind the scenes". For instance, perhaps you think that the world actually exists as a spatially-extended place that is "happening", even when you're not experiencing that? Or perhaps you think that space is itself a part of experience, it "arises with" it and is not "out there" beyond your current perception, in which case you'd recognise the world as having no depth.

In general, whatever you adopt fully ("believe") then your experience will tend to behave "as if" it is the case. This of course make a massive difference to the changes you can make. If the world is actually super-flexible but you have assumed it to be far more rigid, you will be limited in results (except for occasional strange accidents) because you are simultaneously "casting spells" for a solid world *and* a flexible change.

Going Offline

> Q: By temporarily offline do you mean that you need to 'suspend disbelief'?

In a way, yes exactly - but it's good to be a bit more specific. What does it mean to "suspend disbelief"? It means to cease asserting that the world is a certain way. While you are "re-triggering" the world you can't make much change, since you are re-asserting it being how it is right now. That would be like trying to stand up while keeping the idea of sitting down firmly in mind! You have to let the current state "go fuzzy" so that you can "think into it" with a modified version. So I mean something like: temporarily detaching from the thought of "the world". Typically, people get themselves into altered states via trace, meditation, drugs, staring into mirrors, or simply withdraw from that main sensory thread.

An alternative and more permanent alternative to forcing these states is to change your world-model, of course.

The World-Thought

To reiterate this point: All intention affects a part of this world directly and the effects are seen from that point on.

If you adopt the flexible world-model that your experience has no "depth" and is basically a 3D multi-sensory thought, then it becomes clear that every thought you deliberately intend on top gets incorporated into that world-thought to some extent. Detaching from the world-thought, letting its intensity subside (become "daydreamy") and thinking new facts into it is essentially how "jumping" and all these things work.

Cutting and pasting an example from elsewhere:

Owl & Screen Metaphor

You draw a picture of an owl on your TV screen. It is always there, but its visibility depends upon the rest of the imagery onscreen. When the dark scenes of the TV show switch to a bright white scene, suddenly the owl "appears" - it is "manifested". Now instead imagine an owl idea being dissolved "holographically" in the space around you, and replace the notion of dark/white scene with appropriate contexts. Having "drawn" the owl into the space, you go about your day.

Mostly the owl isn't anywhere to be seen, but wherever an appropriate context arises then aspects of the owl idea shine through and are manifest: A man has an owl image on a t-shirt, the woman in the shop has massive eyes and eyebrows like feathers, a friend sends you an email about a lecture at the zoo highlighting the owl enclosure, a newspaper review of *Blade Runner* talks extensively about the mechanical owl in the interrogation scene, and so on.

The Infinite Grid of All Possible Moments

Reposting this to help clear up questions about what happens to "the other you". There is no such thing : what you are doing is selecting a different subjective experience, like shifting to a slightly different dream. This involves thinking of "you" in a slightly different way.

The Infinite Grid of All Possible Moments

Thought I might as well post this here in case anyone finds it a useful metaphor. Below is the description that goes with this animation. The idea is that it can be used as a way of visualising how all time is simultaneous-parallel, and perhaps jumping between "moments" if you want to pursue an alternative to the candles-and-mirror approach.

> **Introduction**
>
> This animation is intended to illustrate the idea that all possible 1st-person perspective moments exist simultaneously - as part of a metaphorical "Infinite Grid".
>
> In this model, what "you" are is the conscious experiencer who "looks through" a particular grid position as a sort of "viewport", and your timeline corresponds to the trajectory you follow across the grid, from moment to moment. Memories are attached to you, the experiencer, rather than to the moments you experience (although information may also be available as part of a particular moment).
>
> We tend to follow sequences of closely-related moments, to form a coherent personal history - however there is no reason why our experience can't be discontinuous and jump across locations, times, and viewpoints, with a mere detaching and shifting of attention.
>
> **The Experience**
>
> At the beginning of the video, you are lying down in your apartment, relaxing; the traffic noise comes through the half-open window and there is light rain against the glass. Soon you let go of the sensations of that moment, the sound echoes and fades as the experience dissolves into the background space, and you become delocalised.
>
> As the image of your apartment fades you realise that you are not that person in the apartment, but instead you are a vast aware space in which all possible moments are simultaneously realised and available. Any and all perspectives are available to you.
>
> Randomly, you recall a holiday you had almost a decade ago, with a friend - or was it the friend's story of his holiday, and you never went? - and an intention forms to attach to that moment, accompanied by a sense of movement, a growing feeling of localisation.
>
> Sounds and images rush forward, as you feel yourself entering a bodily experience once more...
>
> -- *The Infinite Grid of All Possible Moments (16:9)*

[...]

/r/timetravel/: Cross-posting with modifications - the original concept was to provide a way of thinking about the nature of conscious experience and different experiences in a shared world, but I think it works as a way of viewing time travel also.

The Infinite Grid of All Possible Moments

The idea of this animation is that it can be used as a way of visualising how all time is simultaneous-parallel, and perhaps a way of thinking about "jumping between moments". In this scheme, there are no timelines except the history of your own experience, your own trajectory across the possible moments. Although we tend to assume that our intentions and decisions actually, say, directly move our arms or create certain thoughts, what's really happening is that we are *implicitly choosing to shift to a moment which contains the corresponding experience*.

You don't ever "do" anything; you just "select experiences".

Since there is no actual past or future except your own personal sequence of moments, and there are no physical movements because *being-a-body* is just part of the overall sensory experience of a "moment" - there are no paradoxes and no limits on free will. Time travel, in other words, becomes a discontinuous jump in your experience, rather than an actual physical or even mental journey. You are basically "folding away" this moment of 'My Apartment 2015' and "unfolding out" a moment containing the experience of, say, 'Barcelona 2004'. The summary that goes with the video:

> **Introduction**
>
> This animation is intended to illustrate the idea that all possible 1st-person perspective moments exist simultaneously - as part of a metaphorical "Infinite Grid".
>
> In this model, what "you" are is the conscious experiencer who "looks through" a particular grid position as a sort of "viewport", and your timeline corresponds to the trajectory you follow across the grid, from moment to moment. Memories are attached to you, the experiencer, rather than to the moments you experience (although information may also be available as part of a particular moment).
>
> We tend to follow sequences of closely-related moments, to form a coherent personal history - however there is no reason why our experience can't be discontinuous and jump across locations, times, and viewpoints, with a mere detaching and shifting of attention.
>
> **The Experience**
>
> At the beginning of the video, you are lying down in your apartment, relaxing; the traffic noise comes through the half-open window and there is light rain against the glass. Soon you let go of the sensations of that moment, the sound echoes and fades as the experience dissolves into the background space, and you become delocalised.
>
> As the image of your apartment fades you realise that you are not that person in the apartment, but instead you are a vast aware space in which all possible moments are simultaneously realised and available. Any and all perspectives are available to you.

> Randomly, you recall a holiday you had almost a decade ago, with a friend - or was it the friend's story of his holiday, and you never went? - and an intention forms to attach to that moment, accompanied by a sense of movement, a growing feeling of localisation.
>
> Sounds and images rush forward, as you feel yourself entering a bodily experience once more...
>
> -- *The Infinite Grid of All Possible Moments (16:9)*

[...]

Synchronicity abounds - today I came across a review of the TV series *Being Erica*. In the show, the patient undergoes a therapy process which involves their awareness being directed to a previous (or *parallel-previous*) moment. They can then make changes by responding differently within the moment, the repercussions of which are reflected in the subsequent "present". Never seen it - it looks far too rom-com for my liking - but I liked the idea. Dimensional Jumping would be going directly to the "present" that followed from such a change, without the detour.

> > Q1: All I can take from it is that so long as we don't become involved in what we're experiencing we can perceive anything from any view. So we're not really jumping dimensions, we're shifting perception.

Right. And we don't even mean any view right now, or even any view in the past you were involved in. The jump from being in bed to being in a night-time dream is just the same process. We're shifting perception, or I'd say: *attention*, because that retains the notion that you are everywhere-all-at-once anyway, it's just that you are focused on one particular aspect of the infinite pattern. The larger point is that if you want to make particular changes perhaps it's better to have a scheme of thinking that you can absorb in which to do it, which accommodates it, rather than simply let go and kinda intend-hope.

Meanwhile - "everything being available" means both that everything exists and, conversely, that nothing exists but anything can pop into being as required. Doesn't matter which way we conceive of it (not possible to distinguish between the two).

> > Q2: I see you said "infinite pattern",and how how anything can pop into being as required.So,you are saying we experience what we focus our attention to.Therefore we can experience any moment,at any instant of time by focusing our attention. And that everything is in our head,nothing out there?I don't really understand ...What is reality,or is it just in our head/mind?

There is no head/mind except as a sensory experience (or a *thought-about* it) in your awareness. They are real, but only in that sense. One way to say it is that: reality is awareness taking on the shape of experience. In other words, waking life is dreamlike. All possible moments are 'dissolved into' the background of experience - that is what the 'Infinite Grid' metaphor proposes. You don't walk around the world, you instead have the world move within your experience.

The extra bit is that with the 'facts of the world' being dissolved into awareness, it is the shifting of your attention from one aspect of it to another, unpacking one *moment* into sensory experience then another in a non-discontinuous way, that gives the impression that you are living a life as a person, in time and space.

What dictates your trajectory? Your held intentions, expectations and beliefs. Dimensional 'jumping' operates by having you detaching from those - detaching from the 'facts of the world' - thereby allowing them to shift in a way they otherwise could not.

> Q3: So in relation to that... We are still living all the past moments and experiences, even though our direct consciousness is in the present time? There's a 13 year old me out there in first period English... hmmm.

Not quite. Better to say that all possible experiences are present now - like all frames of a movie, except all frames of *all* movies, jumbled up - and available for viewing if you chose. What you are, is the eyes which can view. So there is no "you" in English class (I liked English!) but there is a fully-immersive "moment" that you-as-consciousness could step into if desired. Right now, your attention is on the moment with this "viewing the fascinating outpourings of reddit" image in it.

Maybe I'll go check out your English class moment...

You can potentially experience absolutely anything. We're talking an *infinite* grid., after all. However, extra bit: You could be flicking between everyone's experience right now, but without carrying your identity-memory with you, you'd not know. So doing it *knowingly* is what's important.

Theoretically someone could knowingly see through your eyes, experience you right now. Experiencing your own future, I've had that and others have written properly about it. I've regularly "known" outcomes.

The "thing" of so-called jumping is to detach enough from current sensory experience that your moment-to-moment change is more substantial than normal, in any direction. How far this can go, does I think depend on how much you can loosen the filters on what is possible. I think that's true generally.

> Q4: Did you see the movie Interstellar?

I did indeed! As usual with Nolan: very enjoyable, great visually with some good ideas, but the script over-explains things a little and the imagery is rarely allowed to settle. Nice tesseract visualisation, obviously. :-)

Aside - My own picturing of time comes from "configuration space" type descriptions in Julian Barbour's *The End of Time* and David Bohm's *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*, plus the notion of a "serial universe" suggested by the likes of JW Dunne in *An Experiment with Time*. Dunne's book, *The Serial Universe* is full of lovely grid-like diagrams...

> Q4: Have you researched Anthony Peake's Groundhog day hypothesis and/or Gavin Wince's 3d time model?

Funnily enough, I just read Peake's *Is there Life after Death?* book last weekend. Pretty enjoyable, but I feel he falters in a couple of things. First, the idea that some people are reliving lives whilst others aren't. Not sure how that could work. Also, the separation of the two levels seem to me to be arbitrary. The general idea of effectively being in your "own universe" seems about right, but not quite as he describes. I feel that if he took one step back and viewed it as an entirely pre-made block + attentional focus, he could have wrapped it up nicely. However, he lacks a notion of "what it is that is experiencing" other than "the brain", so it's difficult to make that step. He also gets stuck as to the "why?" of it all, I thought.

Unaware of Gavin Wince.

On the larger thing (since I'm feeling philosophical), I think really what we are exploring is the formatting of our own minds. Science is a collection of interlinked metaphors which have lots of "contact points" for "objective" (shared) experience. We might call that "common" or "baseline" formatting. For everything else, it's about finding active metaphors which link to - *or shape* - subjective (personal) experience. So any good stories can be useful. We can have fun with them and experiment, without having to believe them to be "true" in some independent context.

[...]

Let me give a full answer with background, since I'm not sure what you've read and not, and it's also a good opportunity to bring together some thoughts.

Skippable Background

If you've been reading all our tangled comment discussions over at /r/Oneirosophy, you'll know what the underlying project is, which is basically philosophy -> realisation -> manifestation:

- To develop what I've been calling *Active Metaphors* which can be used to reshape our experience.

  There are no *theories* as such because there is no solid underlying to experience (although there are very ingrained habits). Any descriptions are valid only insofar as they lead to desirable experiences and make sense of experiences to date.

- To get to the essentials and thereby describe and account for: daily experience, "glitch in the matrix" experiences, and direct intentional change.

- To find better ways to lead people to the underlying realisation of the structure of experience and what they "really are", which is independent of the present sensory experience.

My involvement on this subreddit (/r/DimensionalJumping/) came about by accident really: I came across it and thought it maybe a bad idea to having people randomly encounter the sub and do *undirected* detachment, without the awareness and framework that, say, people in /r/occult might have. Multidimensional magick, one of the original forms of this, was basically "submit to my true will on the wheel of fortune" and the instructions themselves compare it to suicide (of your world anyway). It's fun to mess around with concepts and philosophies and ideas - it absolutely is - but since results can be a serious thing, there needs to be an element of caution and a way of thinking about things, so that it's not treated too casually. So here I am.

Meanwhile, I am committed to the view that people shouldn't believe anything unless they've tried it - dismissing something is fine though - so the attitude here is to be "here are ways of thinking about things, try them out". *But* just doing it randomly isn't so good.

Hence encouraging people to experiment with doing low-key stuff (e.g. intentionally creating synchronicity, which underlies everything really) as a way to see how it fits. It pretty easy to prove to yourself that there's "something going on" and it's then up to the person to pursue it or not. If you've read the 'reality-shift' accounts elsewhere you'll find that most people just find it very disturbing, even if it happens deliberately rather than accidentally, because of the implications.

You find you're living in something which behaves a little like "declarative dream world", where everything means what you decide it means.

So, anyway. In terms of reporting my own experiences, I do try to keep my personal stuff out of this and you'll find that anyone who explores this much - whether in a more traditional form or the direct intending that we're describing here - will be inclined to do the same. Most people discuss ideas rather than results. There are basic practical reasons too; people tend to adopt a "law of silence" in magick for reason (avoiding being stuck with certain patterns and bound to others). However...

Jumping & Me: Effects and Side-Effects

Personally I don't do the "jumping" thing as described in the original post here. As linked in the sidebar, it's more about this --

- Overwriting, Deciding and Patterning for extended pattern triggering and autocompletion.

-- which is for experimenting with different metaphors to make changes.

In a sense, there's no real "method" involved - you let go of this thought, you welcome a replacement thought - but a formal super-flexible description is helpful because it provides an intentional route. However, in the main the techniques are intended to create a baseline open state which is as "thin" as possible. When people talk about little strange effects like you describe, they are "collateral shifts" or side-effects from not really having a clear intention. Just like synchronicity experiment where you end up with the same concept overlaid everywhere. They're happening all the time anyway if you pay attention, inconsistencies and persistencies. With directed intention, though, you are being specific, having already set the ground.

So typically we are talking about information acquisition, creating and undoing situations - generally, modifying or defining "facts" without breaking personal reality and making it temporarily no longer "make sense". Those are my experiences and results do happen. You're just doing what you've been accidentally doing anyway, but knowingly. What people will probably tell you is that: If you've done the "releasing/overwriting" work, dealt with a few major bumps, life gets more relaxed and smooth anyway. Unless you are into experimenting in order to understand and play and explore, it then becomes about just maintaining a certain state. Because at some point you're wasting your life:

> “One day the Buddha met an ascetic who sat by the bank of a river. This ascetic had practised austerities for 25 years. The Buddha asked him what he had received for all his labour. The ascetic proudly replied that, now at last, he could cross the river by walking on the water. The Buddha pointed out that this gain was insignificant for all the years of labour, since he could cross the river using a ferry for one penny!”

At some point you can de-pattern yourself to basically stop being very human; if you want to live in the world then you have to remember what you're living for. The balance is to realise the nature of your situation, get rid of unwanted debris, and then enjoy the rest, having a tinker about when you feel so inclined. Having said that...

Teleportation: Endgame For 3D-Imagery-Update

> Q1: I've also seen a comment that you talk about teleportation/change of scene.

I think that came from "*Next: Teleporting for beginners*" which was a little joke, but also deliberate because teleportation is the extreme end of what we are doing - aiming to *observe* discontinuities in experience rather than subsequently discovering them - which is why I've used it in examples.

Since making changes *requires* that you detach from the part of experience you want to change (whether by it being out of sight or just being withdrawn) then I see that experience as the ultimate experiment for personal fun. Time compression with Fotamecus doesn't count, for instance, because you don't experience it happening. I've not done it yet, alas! The method-process would be exactly the same as everything else. You are not really "in" the room you are experiencing; it's present imagery and you can directly experience this fairly easily. So "work in progress" is the idea. But I'm just doing this for enjoyment; perhaps others are more serious about such things and would like to push it further, faster.

Have you done much experimentation yet?

TL;DR: My attitude is: here is the situation as I'm seeing it, if you like those ideas then try experimenting for yourself and see if it's your thing.

So you see where I'm coming from. As to the "basic method" that started this sub, I think that (like the Multidimensional Magick post) it just releases what you are holding back and lets it manifest. So potentially, if you're holding back some fury, then you let go of that, and your world shifts in that way... and then you lock back up again, fixing that state in place! That's why I'm all about encouraging people to have something in mind, and try a more specific approach to change. Candles and mirrors are traditional for all sorts of capers, I guess because they encourage a sort of detached state naturally, and because mirrors themselves are, I think, highly active metaphors.

If you think about it, the only "you" you experience is the one in the mirror. It's only by a trick of thinking that you associate the image with what you are and how you look.

I'd say it's a matter of intention. Let me have a go.

First, let's establish a particular view: that what you "really are" is the consciousness in which experiences arise. So you might have the experience of *being-A-in-the-world* and you might have the experience of *being-B-in-the-world*. The switch you are talking about is a swap between one and the other. You-as-consciousness persists, but the *content* had changed personalities.

If you simply intended that you have the experience of *B* but the world (*A*) is the same, then you've summoned the experience of *being-B-in-the-world-of-A*. You won't have a choice ("what should I do in that situation?") because you won't remember being *A* at all. You will and always will have been *B*. Some crazy folk might come up to you and say you are *A*, but you'll think that's nonsense.

But... that's not what you would do, because with that approach you've basically decided that "I will change by updating my personality and deleting my memory but the apparent world remains the same", and have put them out of step.

The key here is about perspective. There is no 3rd-person view to this, no outside view, you are always choosing *what subjective experience to have in the future*.

What you would actually do is change the whole experience, right? You would "update the world" such that you were and always had been *B* and had no recollection of *A* - you'd update for a consistent experience.

For all you know, you might have already done such a thing last week. One morning last week, you were *C* and working in a coal-mine in New Zealand. You decided to update the world such that you are *invisiblemongoose*, always have been, and are living wherever-you-live-now. And that become true and always true. But something, some itch, some previous trace is still there, and you feel driven to go on reddit and find out about how worlds can be changed overnight...

> Q2: Or does the fact that only my perception have changed and not theirs means that I did something wrong?

Remember, you have to think in terms of 1st-person subjective experience. You wouldn't actually know this; you'd just think that there was a bunch of strange folk telling you that you're someone else.

I remember reading a couple of posts over at /r/tulpas where people were asking about swapping, but I don't remember anything else coming from it.

> Q2: without total faith in the metaphysical phenomena the person wouldn't even swapping at all

Yes, on the tulpa example: I think you're right that such a radical change is going to be all or nothing, whereas the original setup was almost "what if I did it but didn't really?"

If you choose to "switch to personality B and have no memory of A" then that's a different thing to "change the world such that I was always personality B".

> Q2: That's why I think that can't be just a matter of different metaphors, like many discussions seems to point that is all the same thing, but there is obviously a key difference between...

It's a tricky topic so let's try and work through it. When it comes to approaches (1) and (2), they are really the same approach, surely? Reality doesn't work two ways, it has one way. The metaphors are just ways to conceive of change. And if you can conceive of something, you can experience it - because the only difference between an experience and a thought is the brightness and stability of the sensory imagery.

Fundamentally, *anything can happen*. There's no reason at all why this room can't just disappear right now and another room take its place. Why doesn't it do so? Habit or momentum, you might say, and the extent to which I am holding on to - continually activating - current patterns of experience. And implicit in any "decision" is the context and intention.

- If I decide to gradually become a better person, then that's a gradual letting go of patterns, a gradual wearing away, and a slow change in "time".
- If I decide to just instantly become another person, then that requires I completely let go of the current pattern, to allow it to shift more rapidly. This is a type of world-suicide - or more accurately, it's like going to sleep, entering a lucid dream, letting go of all hold over the initial world and never coming back.

The trick to thinking about this is to flip around our conception of the world. We are not bodies or people in a world, we are a "conscious space" in which *being-a-person-in-a-world* type experiences arise. And furthermore, that "conscious space" is infinitely malleable and can take on any shape *at any time*.

Where metaphors come in is that they give you a context for change. If you adopt the metaphor of "the world is a solid spatially-extended place" then your experience will tend to correspond to that: slow change. If you adopt the metaphor of "the world is one of many worlds and we can 'translate' between them", similarly. It provides a path of manifestation.

In both cases it's really the same deal: A dreamlike experience with no solid substrate behind it, which behaves "as if" the ideas you accept are actually true. But the *only* truth is that there is conscious-awareness having experiences.

> Q2: So, is it basically a matter of one's level of detachment from the current patterns of experience?

And yes, that's basically it: we detach such that we aren't constantly re-triggering the current experience, and this allows a more dramatic, discontinuous change to occur in experience. We're basically loosening our hold on the world to let it shift.

> Q2: The person still need to figure out how to reach such a level of detachment...

You can't figure it out. Figuring out is an experience.

> Q2: ...achieving a specific set of skills...

That's an experience too. Detaching isn't an experience or a skill. And so on. Rituals are a way to cheat into detachment: making you hard-focus until you get exhausted or pushing you into a state where sensory experience blanks. But the only way to be detached really is to cease controlling your attention so that it disappears and you are left as an "open space" with your experience floating in it. Detachment is to cease something, not do something.

You don't get better at "doing" visualising as such, I found - you just gradually stop being in the way so much. If you start doing daily visualisation practice, you'll likely notice yourself trying to "paint" the image or make it appear. That won't help though. When you get good at it, what happens is you "want" the image and then it appears "by itself". (EDIT: You *imagine-that* the image is there as a fact, and let it appear by itself.) People call this "the subconscious" or whatever, but really what's happening is that the image, being a continuous part of the intention, is arising without resistance. Your intention to visualise has shifted things, but really it's switching into *allowing* that brings things up a level.

Having said all that, people *do* find rituals and techniques helpful, because they find it easier to believe that something else is doing the work, something else has the power, rather than themselves. But since it's all in your imagination anyway (literally everything), it's just a story you're inventing. You might as well get used to being more detached generally, and just relaxing into a more relaxed state if required for "editing" type activities?

When Biblical stories talk of "faith" (knowing things will happen despite lack of evidence) and "giving up to God" (allowing body, mind and world to shift) and "dedicated prayer" (non-deviation from intention of desire) and "asking and receiving" (declaring what you want, letting it come into experience) and all that, it's

this they mean: giving up *apparent* control in order to gain true understanding and influence. There's no world behind the picture of the room you are experiencing right now, etc.

You could lie on the floor and decide to absolutely just give up control totally and forever, right now, and you'd probably have an interesting experience as a result. (Or: get a bit dusty depending on the state of the floor. Who knows?)

This all makes it sound much more esoteric and complicated that it really is. Although the "world" might seem complex, the actual reality of it isn't. Just like no matter how many scribbles you do on a piece of paper, no matter how tangled the lines, it remains: a piece of paper with scribbles. No matter how many waves there are in fish tank, it's still just water.

Our own technologies are, I think, driven by exactly the same process. The screen you are using does not "work" as you might imagine. Or rather, it works exactly how you *imagine-that* it should - it's just that there is nothing "behind" that imagining.

The classic "beginner's luck" is a thing, I think, and children in their ignorance do occasionally seem to have quite extraordinary experiences - later dismissed as false memories. There's nothing wrong with capitalising on it. Maybe get the children to do everything for us? :-) Well, experimentation is the way to go. There's nothing to it really: be okay with things as they are, and then *imagine-that* things are how they should be.

[...]

> > Q1: a really trippy idea I came across with a few months ago was not parallel time continuums but perpendicular ones. Imagine our universes time line as a horizontal line where left is past and right is future, and then it intersects with a timeline from another universe only it is a vertical line where down is the past and up is the future. An infinite amount of past and future in one universe is a single moment in another universe. This is a good way to stop thinking of time in a linear fashion.

Ah, that's nice. In the animation, I try to show that as you travel across the grid it isn't any-dimensional, it's sort of everything simultaneously intersecting. Perpendicular time would be a great way to think about that! It's similar to the "coloured dye in water" metaphor for awareness/consciousness: Dissolve "dark blue" coloured dye into water and the colour "dark blue" is everywhere, and everything is "dark blue". There is no *substance* to the colour, and yet it is all things and all things are it. Time and space are dissolved into timelines and dimensions in the same way, depending on our perspective.

> > Q2 to Q1: That's an interesting way to look at it but I don't know if it holds up structurally. The way I'm seeing it similar experiences are going to be adjacent to each other in the infinite grid. So really the directional axis doesn't matter at all. What we're calling time is a path that walks us through nodes on the grid. It doesn't matter if the next node you go to is up, down, left, right or twistwise. Any path taken is going to look like a linear ordering of events

The real truth is that, despite the metaphor of the grid for easier comprehension, all moments are dissolved into the background awareness *non-spatially*. They are not located relative to one another at all. And in fact, even locations are themselves non-spatial, in essence. A path, in truth, doesn't "look like" anything. Lines and grids are just a way for us to formulate our intentions symbolically; they only exist in the sense of being mind-formatting.

> Q2: I'm conceiving things as being organized conceptually in a hilbert space.

Then we are agreed!

> Q2: Then if you remove the idea of separate things in the first place the whole thing falls apart.

Or rather... *really* comes together. So, the notion of "parts" is the basis for conceptualising / having a patterned experience - subject to the duality of the background containing all existence (everything) but it all being dissolved (nothing). What that really says is that the background is infinite in all respects, and what we experience is actually the formatting of our own minds. So when we adopt a conceptual framework, we literally *make it so* in our experience to the extent that we fully absorb and align with it. (Reusing a previous idea.)


Enfolded Form
- Residual pattern built up from previous experiences, subject to direct intention
"Experiential Mind-Space"
Unfolded Object
- Experience snaps to and unfolds in alignment with enfolded forms, spontanously and automatically

Fig 1. An illustration of the relationship between enfolded forms (belief, expectation, memory traces) and unfolding experience. In an ongoing feedback process, experiences leave traces which then in-form the structure of subsequent experiences, as spatial and temporal structures - i.e. objects and narrative, respectively. To change the nature of experience requires exposure of the ground to alternative types of experience ("external" change) or a shifting of the form of the ground directly ("internal" or first-cause change).

Which is what 'magick' is, really.

> Q3: ... is also called a "configuration space."

Indeed, a 'Hilbert space'. Julian Barbour's *The End of Time* is good on this, where he describes the idea as a 'Platonia' - a static landscape of "Nows". However, these tend to be envisaged as literal whole physical universes being described by the co-ordinates/parameters, rather than "moments" of sensory experience, which I feel makes more sense. Also he suggests no selection mechanism.

> Q3: ... say that causality can only flow along narrow and specific channels in that grid

There's no particular reason that one moment need follow another continuously, mainly because there is no "time" in which such a following takes place. The change *is* the time. Any continuity is an assumption or expectation of the experiencer. We have something along the lines of:

- We don't ever directly "do" anything; rather, we "select experiences".
- Our experiences are an exploration of our own minds: *"Infinity as filtered through beliefs, expectations knowledge & intention"*
- Time is change, and change is intention (as filtered through the apparent 'facts-of-the-world').

[...]

> A1: This is great. In this model, maybe enlightenment would lead to awareness of the total matrix, and possibly even the ability to jump between locations. And that would imply that each individual is actually the same consciousness focusing on different portions of the matrix. Which would mean that **there are no individuals, and all are really one.**

Yes, this is exactly what the model is shooting for!

Everything is 'dissolved' into the background awareness, all moments and all perspectives, with no fundamental separation - and yet, apparent separation, and individuals, and timelines. It also allows everyone to experience anything, even if there is a requirement that other people experience them doing something else.

We get confused and think that we are a particular body in a particular story, because we've got our faces "pushed up against the glass" of a particular set of moments. If we take a step back, though, we discover our situation is not as we had assumed, and nor are we...

The Imagination Room

Things tend to come up in comments and discussions which then get lost in the fog of history, so I'm posting a few potentially useful fragments as posts to make them easier to find.

The Imagination Room

There is a vast room. The floor is transparent, and through it an infinitely bright light shines, completely filling the room with unchanging, unbounded white light. Suddenly, patterns start to appear on the floor. These patterns filter the light. The patterns accumulate, layer upon layer intertwined, until instead of homogenous light filling the room, the light seems to be holographically redirected by the patterns into the shape of *experiences*, arranged in space, unfolding over time. Experiences which consist of sensations, perceptions and thoughts. At the centre of the room there are bodily sensations, which you recognise as... you, your body. You decide to centre yourself in the upper part of that region, as if you were "looking out from" there, "being" that bodily experience.

At the moment you are simply experiencing, not doing anything. However you notice that every experience that arises slightly deepens the pattern corresponding to it, making it more stable, and more likely to appear again as the light is funnelled into that shape.

Now, you notice something else. If you create a thought, then the image will appear floating in the room - as an experience. Again, the corresponding pattern is deepened. Only this time, you are *creating* the experience and in effect creating a new habit in your world! Even saying a word or a phrase triggers the corresponding associations, so it is not just the simple thought that leaves a deeper pattern, but the whole context of that thought, its history and relationships.

Now, as you walk around today, you will feel the ground beneath your feet - but you will know that under what appears to be the ground is actually the floor of the room, through which the light is shining, being shaped into the experience around you. And every thought or experience you have is shifting the pattern...

A Personal Addressable Voxel-Space

Another way to envisage this is as a voxel space.



Imagine a complete and total void with not even space. Now, imagine a 3-dimensional array of cubes going on forever. Each cube can contain a sensory "pixel" (visual, auditory, texture, taste, feeling). The room you are in now is basically a particular sensory pattern existing in that array.



If you think a thought, that appears in the same voxel-space, only less intense and less stable. However, it leaves a trace upon the space, a slight deformation, however subtle - which results in a momentum from the current state towards the state described or *defined* by the thought.

If you are completely detached (is in, not "persisting" other patterns) then the transition between states is effortless and clean. Otherwise, what occurs is a mangling between the present state and the thought, and any other thoughts you are holding onto or resisting. So when you "look back" you are literally re-defining the target of the voxel-space to your previous state again. That's why lots of "manifestation" type techniques recommend "letting go of your desire". Not because you need to forget what you are after, but because our tendency is to re-created the "state of desiring" when we think about it.

Imagining That

When we talk of imagination and imagining something, we tend to think about a maintained ongoing visual or sensory experience. We are *imagining* a red car, we are *imagining* a tree in the forest.

However, imagination is not so direct as that, and to conceive of it incorrectly is to present a barrier to success - and to the understanding that **imagining and imagination is *all that there is*.**

We don't actually imagine in the sense of maintaining a visual, rather we "imagine *that*". We imagine *that* there is a red car and we are looking at it; we imagine that *there* is a tree in the forest and we can see it. In other words, *we imagine or 'assert' that something is true* - and the corresponding sensory experience follows.

We in effect *recall* the details into existence.

It is in this sense that we imagine being a person in a world. You are currently imagining *that* you are a human, on a chair, in a room, on a planet, reading some text. We imagine *facts* and the corresponding experience follows, even if the fact itself is not directly perceived. Having imagined *that there is* a moon, the tides still *seem to* affect the shore even if it is a cloudy sky.

And having imagined a fact thoroughly, having imagined that it is an *eternal* fact, your ongoing sensory experience will remain consistent with it forever. Until you decide that it isn't eternal after all.

Exercise: When attempting to visualise something, instead of trying to make the colours and textures vivid, try instead to fully accept the fact of its existence, and let the sensory experience follow spontaneously.

Next up: Teleporting for beginners.

[...]

So, idea-fact-thing-pattern intensified and accepted! There's no how or why needed at all; that's just additional narrative dressing. It's never necessary to "work things out" or even justify things in any way. Those are just routes towards, finally, allowing something to be the case. Realising and integrating the "fact" that nothing is concrete (even the experience of "concrete") is probably a good first step, actually.

So, your dimension = what you are is the environment in which all appears. All other characters are just as real as *you-as-person*, in the sense that you are "real", because *you-as-person* is just part of the environment too. It just so happens that you have taken on that particular perspective. If you need a model for the sharing, I'd suggest that rather than a shared "environment", the so-called world is a "shared resource of information" and each of us has access to it, like a box of patterns we can use to build and change things. You can do what you want with your copy of the world, and just think that the overlap with the appropriate aspects of other perspectives will take care of itself.

Philosopher Marcus Arvan actually promotes a P2P hypothesis which is like a non-centralised game. However, if the apparent overlap is itself defined by your copy of the world, then basically it's "as if" you dictate the shape and contributions of other nodes too.

[...]

There is no external. So, plot twist: there is no internal either! Yes, everything is pretty good fun. :-)

Well, you'll probably already get a few more red cars in your life just as a result of reading that post. ;-)

The fun is in pushing to skip intermediate experiences.

I'm really saying it'll come for free. I'm saying that the way to experience a vivid object is to imagine *that* there is one, and let your experience fall into line. You can't "vivid" the image directly, because it has no substance. But obviously vividity is desired.

The exercise (as described) is for "mind" visualisation rather than external creation (let's not go there yet).

I found taking that approach completely changed my results. Instead of trying to "draw" the image of a cube floating before me, I declared there to be one there - letting the "drawing" take care of itself. Because if something is there, *of course* I can see it. "Leading in", to make the desired result an obvious and inevitable conclusion. Harnessing the auto-complete function.

> Q1: Especially with you talking about teleporting next.

It's a fun exercise. And if you are truly dedicated...

> Q1: This wasn't obvious to me at all [mind level]...

They're the same. Sorry, I'm actually confusing things by typing away here on mobile (not least due to autocorrect). The post is about material-level visualisations (experiences) that you aren't even aware you've made via "imagining *that*". In short, your life as you (or "people") are living it now, usually without realising.

"Imagining *that*" shows that we produce experiences by implying their inevitability according to facts we have accepted or allowed. The exercise deliberately doesn't differentiate; the process is identical. The only difference is... the immediacy of the change from an image to an experience, and the directness of the correspondence. Visualising will always lead to some result of some sort. What sort of fact are you creating?

"Imagine *that*" there is a cube in front of you. Does a cube intensify, materialise, condense, drop to the ground in front of you? Or do you walk into the next room to find that the TV is showing a program about 4D geometry and the history of the tesseract (thus giving you both the cube and the context).

How real does it have to get before it changes from being "triumph" to "terrifying"?

> Q1: You're willing to take us as far as any of us dare to go, am I right? Or am I right?

What can I say? When you're right, you're right - and you're right. :-)

Okay, I'm going to say: no effort at all. Relax, and quietly and continually assert the fact of its existence. Don't interfere at all with whatever arises in the senses. After all, when there is (say) an apple in front of you, do you try to make it more vivid? Of course not. The object is a fact, it's appearance is inherent - the images comes to you, you simply receive it. *Let the world come to you.*

So again: focus on the *fact of existence*. Quietly assert the fact in a mood of expectation until it feels and becomes "true".

I used to mess with my eyesight/seeing all the time. A lot of this whole thing is because of that - realising that surely it is indirect, and sensory experience is spontaneous and effortless. Instant vision improvement. Because you don't see with your "eyes", unless you really try to.

Anyway, you get idea. It comes back to what you were saying about still feeling that there is a difference between mind and physical. Well, it's really all imagination - images arising in correspondence with imagined facts. But if so, why does manifestation tend to occur via an intermediate sequence of experiences? Because we are highly resistant to sensorily experiencing a discontinuity. Continuity of experience is a very ingrained "fact". How to break down the barrier and realise that it's all just envisioned facts within your awareness?

One way is to explore direct creation and feeling the pushback. However, that does tackle an important assumption: that we assume that objects are *in* locations. Actually, a location is part of the property of an object. Including the object of "the person that is you". The facts of your location is an attribute of your apparent object.

And that is why attempting teleportation is a good exercise. You don't *go* to a new location - rather, you change the location-fact of your bodily object and your sensory experience falls into alignment accordingly. *The location comes to you*.

> Q1: Location is a relative property.

Maybe that was too precise. What I'm trying to say is that location is the fact of an object, not its environment or landscape. To move something, you assign the object a new place *or indeed no place at all*; you do not update the inventory list of a location.

> Q1: Makes sense. But actually living with the consequences of having performed this is the hardest part.

Right. Even the smallest shift can be troublesome. This is a whole other level. Say you do the teleportation exercise and the image of this room fades from your awareness, to be replaced with the image of the room next door. What's next? An important outcome is, instead of just thinking about being an aware space and all that, you will *actually know as a direct fact that you have no location*.

I'd suggest that lived knowledge is the only true knowledge. All else is *thinking-about*. And of course, it's not just a matter of not being located; it's a matter of not being a person. We shall see who is up for dedicating themselves to the exercise.

> Q1: [I'd suggest that lived knowledge is the only true knowledge.]; That's definitely wrong. Aspirational knowledge before it is lived, when based on proper reasoning is also true.

I'm going to revise my statement and say "lived from". You can *live from* knowledge and that is different to *thinking-about*. Aspirational knowledge is something you live *from*.

Things can sound a bit prescriptive and uncompromising in these conversations, but that's just an artefact of keeping things to the point. Of course, development is often muddled and confusing and evolving - this way and then that, feeling our way along - and sometimes scary. My thinking has historically been all over the place, for instance, and I have been mostly on the wrong track. But I think everyone finds what they are comfortable with and want to "live from" in their own time. But the extent that they *live from* it will dictate the extent to which it appears to be true in experience. They can adopt this or that, and this or that will then be there.

There's no "what we should do". I mean, there's a healthy opinion that people should live their lives fully as given, and leave the underlying patterning well alone. Y'know, just enjoy the fruits! :-) Life doesn't actually necessarily require ongoing reality-maintenance; just some occasional fantasising and an open attitude can be sufficient for most. This stuff is for when we get curious about how much tinkering is possible.

> Q1: This can take time.

Absolutely. I'm not saying this will just happen. You might need to spend hours, days. But those hours must be spent without effort, keeping the assertion below the level of strain. And there might be all sorts of patterns criss-crossing in the way.

Part of the process is that these will all appear uncovered and then fade. But you don't need to do any investigation and go looking; just by keeping focused these things will come up. You "sit with them" and acknowledge them, and they pass.

> Q1: In general I have an unhealthy habit of confusing struggle with directedness that is pure intent.

I was really guilty of "efforting" and thinking that was how to make things happen. Still do sometimes of course. The whole "Just Decide" thing came from that. Unhurried patience and acceptance is the way, but it's not easy to stick to. It's much easier for things that you don't *need* to happen. If you can get curious about the experience that is happening along the way, that really helps for me.

> Q1: [And there might be all sorts of patterns criss-crossing in the way.]; I don't know what you mean by this.

Oh, just all sorts of intermingled assumptions and resistances.

> Q2: On a related note, there are people who *can't* mentally visualize.

Very true. Although I'd add: *at the moment*, for everyday folks.

I think lots of people only have 'felt' visualisation by default. That last link pretty much describes how it was for me. It took me a long time to be able to 'image'. I could *feel-know* the object in a location, but I didn't really see it there. I could feel its rotation and movement though. And trying to manually "draw" the image part didn't help.

The approach of 'asserting' was what got me there really, although I conceived of it as a sort of autosuggestion. I got the idea partly from a NLP story where he basically just paced/led and told them that they could see pictures vividly in front of them when they desired. And then they could.

I figured: Why need the hypnosis aspect? All that we're doing with that is accepting one suggestion which *implies* another fact. Creation by implication, like in lucid dreams. I can see the world around me, in both waking and dreaming life so nothing's wrong with the "mechanism" really. Why not assert that there is a bright mental object there, which of course means it would be vivid, and let the sensory aspect come? Start with the *feeling of presence*, and allow the evidence to appear.

Of course, different for everyone. And that is basically hypnosis by another name.

There's probably a lot more we could explore here in this area. There's a whole thing about imagination and perception in general, and "letting the world come to you" rather than striving to manipulate and control the senses, graspingly.

> Q2: By this do you mean allowing the manifestations occur in a way that is congruent, as in not a discontinuity?

No, not necessarily. I mean literally *not straining* to sense or see things. In my thinking: Change is an indirect thing: you update the *facts-of-the-world* and then your sensory experience falls in line with this. Sensory experience, being a sort of 'mirage' that is based upon those facts, is something you just let happen therefore; you can't actually interact with it.

For the biggest changes, you need to withdraw yourself from the current patterns - particularly, withdraw your emotional involvement (because although it's just another sense, that maintains patterns more than anything).

Withdraw yourself from requiring plausibility and continuity.

That's why you should go about being 'non-attached':

- There is no solidity to sensory experience anyway; it's the image that floats above the hologram, as it were.
- While you are emotionally engaged with the sensory experience, you are grasping onto and persisting the patterns that produce it. This prevents change.

The problem is, any indecision you have is reflected in your sensory experience. If you 'kinda think' one thing but 'kinda think' another, that muddle will muddle your experience! That is why *looking for evidence* doesn't work. The world (seems to) align with your approach to it, whatever it is. There is actually no "how it really is" behind the scenes to uncover, no secret structure except what has been accumulated as patterns over time.

That's where the whole "faith" thing comes in - which really means that you should ignore what your senses are telling you, and continue to *assert* what you desire. Given this knowledge, what seems like a good idea is to assert the most flexible worldview possible. Stop thinking about stuff (that just muddies the waters) and *declare things* instead. There are lots of metaphors you can adopt for this - my favourite at the moment is The Imagination Room, where the transparent floor is patterned in such a way as to filter the 'creative light' shining from underneath, into a fully immersive sensory image; change the patterns = change the facts -> change the image, but you are always in "the room" no matter where you *seem* to be.

Set aside a half hour, sit somewhere quiet, and do nothing except *assert* silently and effortlessly that this is a dream world made entirely from your imagination and assumptions. Just focus lightly on this as a fact, and see what happens.

> Q2: ...instead I imagine the within is the unmanifest void of possibility and unlimited love.

Nice also, since it has an associated feel. The reason I use the room metaphor sometimes is that, unlike alternatives such as a 'holographic aware space in which images condense' (which might be more accurate), it has a sensory aspect which can be used as a reminder: We all feel the ground beneath our feet, and whenever we notice that it can be used as a trigger to remember - "ah, the floor through which the light shines, to create my experience". It brings us back to the understanding.

> Q2: I do not wish to uproot the tree...

Which is exactly fine. Power is the ability to have the experiences you desire, and what you desire is your own business. Others may crave absolute freedom from all conventions and so on, but the real freedom is to choose the conventions you like, and within those explore the possibilities.

> Q2: I mean, I made this system didn't I?

You made it, but you did it *unknowingly*. Now you can do it deliberately and with knowledge. Instead of trying to work out what's going on, changing your mind as you go between different metaphors, resulting in an erratic experience, you can now simply select the one you *like* and *step into that one*.

Once things settle, it's likely you'll just want to enjoy it. Make occasional adjustments. Always 'skipping to the final result' means you don't have the intermediate experiences. Sometimes that's good; often those experience are where the living of life actually takes place.

> Q2: Do we know that I did it unknowingly? Couldn't I have knowingly chosen to forgot in order to experience it in a novel way after having built it?

Quite right, in terms of the life you appeared in, at the point you appeared in it. Plan out the obstacle course, then deliberately forget the design! I was thinking more that, having forgotten (perhaps deliberately) your own powers of creation, you have since then been making changes to your reality without knowing it. But now you know again, you can - um - be more careful with it. :-)

> Q2: For me it's the same except I retreat inward to that interior space, sort of like where the observer of all this is, almost as though he is the one exhaling out forms and ideas into his television set.

That's good. Another I've used to remind myself is "two-way looking" - placing my attention both outward into the space in front of me and inwards into the space I'm "looking out from". This makes it easy to notice that it's all floating in a big infinite space. There's a literal gap where you normally assume "you" to be.

A Line Of Thought, All Thoughts Are Facts

I've been looking for simpler ways to describe the essentials of The Patterning of Experience, ways that don't require too much background. The core insight of course remains that "what we are" is a conscious space or perspective. Beyond this, though, it's how to describe content and change in a way that's practically useful.

This bullet-point summary was part of an experiment for getting people to move their bodies effortlessly (streamlining the Alexander Technique), visualise more easily (summon rather than create), and provide an intuitive way of thinking about generating deliberate synchronicity. Posting it here in case others find it of use.

We *recall* things into existence.

A line of thought...

- The world is just a line of thought, albeit a bright and stable and immersive one.
- The world has no depth.
- Dissolved into the background space are all possible forms and relationships. It's like a toy box filled with pre-made shapes and layouts, objects and containers.
- To bring them into worldly existence, we merely have to *recall* them.
- To recall them is to superimpose those patterns upon current experience. They are incorporated and "manifest" wherever context permits.
- The more specific we are with our recall, the more narrowly defined the context. (For instance, we might incorporate a timeframe or location or circumstance, and manifestation would be constrained appropriately.)

Manifestation vs synchronicity...

- An 'intention' is simply the name for a pattern which we want to see incorporated into our life.
- It can be non-sensory, since it can be the overall *felt-sense* of the pattern, without it necessarily being expanded into the sensory.
- What separates an intention from recall is the introduction of a specific spatial and temporal context plus, typically, a subjective viewpoint.
- This marks the difference between experiencing *manifestation* (including body movements, thoughts, "results") and *synchronicity* (the appearance of the same patten across unrelated situations).
- If you can recall (conceive of) something, you can experience it.

See also this related comment below: *All Thoughts Are Facts*

An alternative formulation of the same thing, for those who like to envisage the nature of a persistent state of all logical possibilities which is being modified by re-emphasis:

All Thoughts Are Facts

On using the *world-as-thought* perspective as a way to create deliberate synchronicity and therefore particular scenes:

- You are an "open conscious space" in which thoughts arise. The apparent world is basically a very bright, stable, full 3D-sensory immersive strand of thought.
- The world evolves by the accumulation of observations or "facts".
- Every thought you have about the world is *literally* adding a new fact to the world.
- Thoughts which randomly arise simply reveal the current state of the world.
- If you deliberately think a thought, then you are deliberately adding a new fact to the world. (This is how to make changes.)
- The more intense the thought, the stronger the influence of that “fact” upon your experience.
- If you respond emotionally to a random thought, then you are in effect re-thinking it as a more intense thought, meaning it will contribute more. (Hence fearful thoughts tend to increase the prevalence of fear-related experiences; however this works just as well for nice-emotion thoughts.)
- If you “grasp” onto a thought then you are persisting it - you are maintaining it at its present level of intensity and not letting it fade and be “forgotten”.

Things such as detachment, surrender, abandoning yourself, and so on, are all about letting the current dominant thoughts or “facts” become softer and fade, letting the world shift freely, and allowing other thoughts to shift into prominence.

[...]

For the world having no depth, /u/Utthana just summarised this nicely:

> **[Utthana**: There's no objective reality hiding behind your experiences just waiting to be experienced. It manifests when, and only when, it's experienced.]

For the context aspect: it's that things will usually arise in circumstances which "make sense" according to your expectations. The looser your acceptance of the world, the broader the definition of acceptable context becomes. In terms of intention being non-sensory: the *felt-sense* is that "global meaning feeling" associated with things. For instance, when you decide to win an arm wrestle (silly example) then you may or may not have a visual-auditory-textural visualisation arise for that, but the "unpacked *felt-meaning*" of that instead.

Additional: For what you are trying to so, you basically want to: not do it. You want to *recall* the target state while forgetting the start state. Just as when you get out of a chair, you should do so by *recalling* the state of being stood up without first re-remembering sitting or moving in stages (let experience flow "by itself" towards the shape of standing). As a general help, you might find it useful to recall the experience of being a completely open, unfilled space. Remember that the "memory" already exists, you are just bringing it unto sensory experience.

> Q1: Some interestingly seem to be "further into the background" than others. I haven't nailed why latency is variable yet. Thoughts?

I think of it as being that their "amplitude" has faded over time and so they need some more "summoning" - in much the same way as a distance memory may take a little allowing in order to have it come back to full strength.

> Q1: I'm not entirely sure what you're trying to convey with "wherever context permits", but theoretically, any experience can be instantly manifested anywhere, in any way.

Agreed - but if you specify a time and location, for instance, then you have deliberately narrowed the context. The notion of "context" here is pretty open, see the little example I've attached below. Context is also about the association a situation brings, and so on.

> Q1: Non-sensory is far easier for most people, I suspect. Might not have been a few hundred years ago, but is now.

It is. Which is a problem when combined with the "only visual-auditory-texture is real" as their assumptions, because they don't understands they are making changes, or they try to "experience themselves doing" which can get in the way. And yes, it's interesting that "to concieve" is associated both with giving birth, creation, and with ideas and notions. (For instance.) And when you give birth, you are doing so to something that *already exists* - you are just bringing it into "the world". That word alone tells us pretty much all we need to know it seems!

Owl & Screen Metaphor

You draw a picture of an owl on your TV screen. It is always there, but its visibility depends upon the rest of the imagery onscreen. When the dark scenes of the TV show switch to a bright white scene, suddenly the owl "appears" - it is "manifested". Now imagine an owl idea being dissolved "holographically" in the space around you, and replace the notion of dark/white scene with appropriate contexts. Having "drawn" the owl into the space, you go about your day. Mostly the owl isn't anywhere to be seen, but wherever an appropriate context arises then aspects of the owl idea shine through and are manifest: A man has an owl image on a t-shirt, the woman in the shop has massive eyes and eyebrows like feathers, a friend sends you an email about a lecture at the zoo highlighting the owl enclosure, a newspaper review of *Blade Runner* talks extensively about the mechanical owl in the interrogation scene, and so on.

> Q2: [An 'intention' is simply the name for a pattern which we want to see incorporated into our life.]; Interesting, so do you think our ability to be able to name it (whatever we're recalling) is of much importance then? At the very least I'd imagine it'd help. I'm thinking though that there are a plethora of minute or subtle experiences, or even distant ones (in a sense of compatibility with our current pattern we're in) that we don't have a name for. How do we go about recalling those ones?

I think naming helps, because a name or word is inherently part of the pattern it 'represents' and triggers it. (If it didn't trigger, you wouldn't know it, because to know it is to experience it, at least at low intensity.)

If you can conceive of it, you've party recalled it. If you can't conceive of it, it doesn't exist for you anyway?

[...]

> Q1: Reminds me of a line from Star Trek - "Nothing unreal exists" - Spock

i. e. it is not event possible to imagine a thing, event or world that is not a part of existence, however, it may be a part of a reality frame that is not accessible from this one.

He's a logical guy, that Mr Spock! And after all, possibilities are concepts in "logical space". If you can conceive of something, you can experience it in some form - because of course even just the conceiving of it is the experiencing of it in some form.

If you adopt a new perspective on your apparent reality, you find that *in effect* you have a private copy of the world. Your experience is basically an ongoing immersive thought *about* being in that world. So you can change that apparent world however you like, and that includes your experience of other people's situations.

Your question is then inevitably: in what sense am I sharing the world with other people? And the answer is something like: it's more like sharing a "resource" than an "environment", like everyone has access to the same library of possible experiences.

It's actually super-simple it's just very hard to put into words! If I were you I'd simply choose to completely accept one of the two metaphors listed in the sidebar and take it from there. (They are designed to give you an easy way to adopt this without having to worry about the details.)

Then, every day spend ten minutes lying down on the floor and "playing dead", giving up control, surrendering completely to gravity, releasing your mind and body and especially attentional focus, letting them move however they want - to get used to what detaching is like. (It feels nice to do this anyway. Nothing to achieve, no aim other than allowing things to shift about as they please. The most relaxing thing you can ever do.)

Sync-TV: The Owls Of Eternity™

What's On TV?

One way of thinking of your current experience is that you are a conscious being who has tuned into one of a billion different TV channels. Each TV show has been filmed from a 1st-person perspective viewpoint. You are a viewer who has forgotten that he isn't actually the character onscreen.

Doing a "jump" means to select a custom channel which fits your desires. The selection mechanism operates by using your thoughts. You imagine part of the content of the destination channel; the mechanism then autocompletes the selection!

The problem, though, is that without realising it we have our thoughts firmly fixed to the control panel at its current settings. So before a change can happen, we need to loosen that and detach from the scenes we're watching now. Only then can the channel mechanism perform the autocomplete. This makes it clear that there is no other "you" who gets left behind when you "jump", and nor does anyone get displaced:

- When you change the channel on a TV, do you leave behind another "you" still watching the previous channel? Obviously not.
- When you change the channel on a TV, does the previous channel still "exist" even if nobody is watching it? Does it matter? Surely not.

Synchronicity TV

We can modify the TV metaphor and make it more subtle, to help us imagine how selection and synchronicity works. Instead of switching to another channel, we are going to *modify* our *current* channel to make the content more pleasant. By doing this, we're in effect creating or shifting it into a customised channel. In this example, we really want to experience more owls in our life, apparently without regard to the constraints of time and space and causality.

For this, you draw a picture of an owl on your TV screen. From that point, the owl picture always there, but its visibility depends upon the rest of the imagery onscreen. When the dark scenes of the TV show switch to a bright white scene, suddenly the owl "appears" - it is "manifested". Now we adapt this to daily life. Imagine an owl idea being dissolved "holographically" in the space around you, and replace the notion of dark/white scene with appropriate contexts. Having "drawn" the owl into the space, you go about your day.

Mostly the owl isn't anywhere to be seen, but wherever an appropriate context arises then aspects of the owl idea shine through and are manifest: A man has an owl image on a t-shirt, the woman in the shop has massive eyes and eyebrows like feathers, a friend sends you an email about a lecture at the zoo highlighting the owl enclosure, a newspaper review of *Blade Runner* talks extensively about the mechanical owl in the interrogation scene, and so on.

The Owls Of Eternity™

Note that the manifestations occur from the point of thought onwards - and that the owl pattern is overlaid on all subsequent experience regardless of prior observations. Hence, owl-related events might arise which, in the standard view, must seemingly have their origins in external events prior to your act.

You may also notice, say, lots of owl-related items in your house which surely must always have been there. You may even find yourself noticing owl-related aspects when you recall events from your (apparent) past. In fact, you may well start feeling uncertain as to whether these things always *have-existed* or whether they only now *have-existed* as a result of your act.

These owls are spatially agnostic and have no respect for temporal matters! (8>)=

Note: These examples are linked to the ideas described in *A Line Of Thought* and *The Patterning of Experience*.

[...]

> Q3: You put a trademark on this?! This is nothing more than telling somebody to have a positive outlook on something and it will happen, but with a TV metaphor.

Um, the trademark is of course comedic™. Although the exercise does not happen in the way you are suggesting.

If you actually do the exercise, the progression of plausible explanation scales something like this:

- conf. bias > coincidence > synchronicity > "manifestation" > shifting > "jumping"

They're all just varying levels of "pattern selection" or activation or overlay, of course. The exact same attentional mechanism that's always happening when we redirect ourselves, just to a greater extent. The thing to consider is, what are you selecting the pattern *from?*

You might be tempted to say that we select the pattern from the 3D-immersive environment around us, but actually that apparent 3D-immersive environment is the *result* of pattern selection.

Strictly speaking, you of course can't tell the difference between noticing more of something and there *being* more of something, but when *events* arise that's a little different. And there's plenty of scope for changing the target and being more restrictive, to further prove to yourself there's more to it that that. If B-M could be described as "pattern selection from a 3D scene", then this effect is like experiencing "pattern selection from a 4D environment".

As I say, you have to actually do it. Just thinking about it, you don't learn anything other than, well, what you think will happen. It's quite good fun, the more you play with it, the more interesting the results can get.

So, it's like changing state - having a different set of patterns become more prominent. There are lots of different metaphors that can be used, but things like "TV channels" give you the feeling that there are states or patterns which are latent, they are just not currently "happening" until you trigger them into experience.

Synchronicities are an interesting side of it, definitely. It's very much a potential example of the "patterning" of experience - i.e. that both sensory experience and thoughts arise in the same perceptual space, and the same forms appear in both. If you see senses and thought as separate, this seems incredibly mysterious (how can the "outside world" know that I was thinking that?) but seeing the two as arisings within the same mental space makes it more palatable, and is a better starting point for contemplation and theorising.

I'd be wary of thinking of things as *literally* being levels (although it's a handy way to visualise things); I tend to think it better to try to connect everything to direct experience in some way. So for instance, you might play with the view that all potential experiences ("3D frames" of experience) are always present, always in the

background, and it's just that some are much "brighter" than the others, and so dominate experience. A bit like how the daytime sky is dominated by the sun, but actually the stars are still there.

The only way to really investigate experience is, of course, to experiment with it, and see what happens. So long as we treat all experiences *as just experiences*, and don't get too caught up in the patterns we create (no "messages from God" or "signs we live in a computer simulation"), then this can only be beneficial, I'd say.

> Q1: Interesting, but doesn't this lead to solipsism?

Not solipsism, because "you" aren't actually a person, what you are is a conscious perspective that is "before" the experience of separation. There's not "only you" because you are in effect taking on the shape of all people; it's just that your sensory experience is from a particular vantage point. In effect we experience a private copy of the world, and so does "everyone else". The nature of the overlap between us isn't like the sharing of an "environment", it's more like the sharing of a "resource", a toy box of possible patterns and experiences. This is difficult to describe in words, because in this view space and time are parts of experiencing - so we can't actually talk about different perspectives being located relative to each other or occurring at the same or different times, but language presupposes such "parts" and "locations".

The *Hall of Records* metaphor is one way to approach it. Basically, all conscious perspectives will turn out to be the same perspective in the end.

> Q1: If everyone is watching his own private TV channel, then the other people in your life are fictional.

So are you, though, in terms of "being a person". Going beyond the metaphor: you're not fictional, you just aren't what you thought you were.

> Q1: ...the "everything is fiction and I am actually God playing with puppet theater" approach. That's just solipsism.

Yeah, it's not really, although that metaphor obvious implies a separation, as if there's a "you" and a "theatre". A better descriiption is to say it's more like everyone is an "imagination space" in which their experiences appear. Everyone exists 'parallel-simultaneously' in a sense, although the relationship between people can't really be described. This is because the perception of space and time is *part of an experience*, rather than a context in which experiences arise; you can't really talk about how different perspectives co-exist. The *Infinite Grid* and *Hall of Records* metaphors give one way to think of this.

But... If you stop thinking of the world as a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time" and instead think of it more as a "resource" which contains all possible experiential pattens, that's closer to the mark I'd say. Right now, you are a "consciousness' which is "taking on the shape of" experiences - specifically the experience of *being-a-person-in-a-world*. And everyone else is too. It's just that you are not in the same place and time; rather, you are all sharing the same "toy box" of experiences. And when we say "everyone" there, really we can't talk about it being lots of *people* that are living in a world; it's more like lots of parallel-simulataneous *experiences* that are happening.

> Q1: How is this different from "we are the universe experiencing itself subjectively"?

It's not different at all, although we have to be careful what we are calling "we", because apparently being "you" is part of the experience. I wrote the phrase *being-a-person-in-a-world* in the earlier comment, but the next step is to rephrase this as "taking on the shape of":

- *being-a-world-from-the-perspective-of-a-person*

Where "world" is in the larger sense of the concept, as something like the currently active patterns or "facts". This leaves the universe as being something like "all possible states".

> Q1: All these parallel experiences are your experiences, you are living through every one of them.

For sure, but not "yours" in the sense of being a person. Rather, it is in the sense of being "that which has or takes on the shape of experiences".

> Q1: Still, this worldview is unsatisfactory to me.

What aspects do you find unsatisfying or problematic?

> Q1: For one, it rejects anything that can be observed because it's all in the imagination space anyway.

Well, I'd say that *aspects* of anything, as patterns, can be brought into sensory form, and that's what you are experiencing right now. Is this so different to seeing the world as made from atoms "out there" and you being trapped in a skull "in here"? This way, you have no boundary and the whole universe is "dissolved" inside you.

Even in the standard model of perception, you are not observing anything directly. If you go with the idea that there are nerve impulses being sent to your brain and within that a multi-sensory image of the world is created - you still end up with a similar result in a way. The result is that, right now, looking around this room, all of it is just mental imagery floating in your "perceptual space" - i.e. your mind.

The only difference is that we are recognising that, since we never experience anything beyond this "perceptual space", and that even our thoughts about an "external world" arise inside that same space, really there is *no such thing* as an outside, stable place.

Sure, we can *pretend* that there is one, based on how our experiences seem to have some habitual regularity to them, but the actual existence of a stable "substrate" that supports them, is fiction and faith.

> Q1: There are no really rigid basic rules that can never be broken, because it's imagination space anyway.

Again, this is not so different to the standard view in a way. The "laws of physics", for instance, are not laws in the sense of being fundamental to the universe and being obeyed by all things. Scientifically speaking, a "law" is a general rule inferred by observation. We have observed certain "regularities" or habits in our experiences of the world and, combined with the *concept* of an objective external 3D place, we imagine that there is a stable place which unfolds consistently with those regularities. But we *are* just imagining it to be the case.

In fact, the "laws of physics" have changed many time over the last 100 years, never mind the last 1,000. The "physical universe" of today is drastically different to the "physical universe" of 100 years ago...

So we're left in much the same position in the standard model, as with the "imagination room" model:

- We only ever experience our own minds. Any "external world" is completely imaginary and without direct evidence.
- We observe regularities in our experience. Any "laws" are completely imaginary and without direct evidence.

The benefit of actually recognising this, though, is that the direct experience of being open and unbounded and "the space in which everything arises", is actually very nice. As an *idea* it sounds cold and empty and lonely; as a *reality* it is the opposite.

> A1: ["As an idea it sounds cold and empty and lonely; as a reality it is the opposite."]; This is exactly as I'm finding it to be - a somewhat disturbing or even frightening idea, at first, but before long you see it is your saviour, your Best Friend, your Self. The key is to work with it - work with it as if you were 5 years old again. :)

That's a nice image, actually. There's definitely a "return to childhood" aspect to it.

You don't need to do anything, don't *even* be on the lookout for them. They know how to take care of themselves.

Just do this: Right now, take five minutes and spend it imagining that there is an owl in front of you in this room - but before you begin, *decide-that* imagining this owl *means-that* "my life will be filled with owls from this moment onwards". Then carry on with your life.

You don't have to *prevent* thoughts about them - passing thoughts are inevitable, and that's totally fine. That's different from replaying things *deliberately* and tinkering with them.

If you think of every *deliberate* thought as being a direct interaction with the world, then you can see where this comes from: A *passing* thought is simply revealing the state of you-and-world as it is; let them pass and they will fade. A *deliberate* thought, meanwhile, increases the intensity and therefore the contribution of that pattern; choose them wisely.

The pouring of that water *is* the changing of the situational pattern. Literally. Your work is done, so there is no need to revisit it. The summoning of the owl *is* the intensification of the owl pattern; no need to do more.

Main points -

- Let passing thoughts pass without intensifiying them.
- If you are *actively* thinking, then treat those thoughts as a direct intensification of those thought's patterns and therefore their contribution to your experience.
- In general, if you are thinking actively, you should always be thinking from the *end-state* that you desire - not the start state or the process. Again, a thought = a literal increasing of the contribution of that pattern/state.

There are all these "rules" that people have come up with over the years in systems like LOA, without giving the reasoning (or perhaps without even having a reason), so it's good to try and clarify.

The key is to remember that this is a "dumb" process. You are simply turning up the dial on some possible experiences while letting other ones fade out - either directly (the owls exercise) or indirectly (the glasses exercise). **There is no intelligence at work other than you and your intention.**

I'd say, you summon the feeling that would be associated with it. Just as picturing an owl triggers all experiences associated with an owl image, so summoning a feeling triggers all experiences associated with *that*. (That's why some people advocate just generating a feeling linked with non-specific phrases like "oh, it's amazing!" and "life is so wonderful!")

The fact that you even have an idea of something you want, means you already have *some sort* of sensory fragment. So imagine what it would be like if *that fragment* were being experienced right now - rather than the seeing of the thing or whatever.

I'd just intensify the fragment. That alone will also intensify the contribution of its extended pattern to your experience. Another trick: imagine that the air around you were being filled with the "atmosphere" of that fragment, its "essence". Feel that atmosphere become stronger and more prominent. Live with that as you go about your day.

It's a nice exercise because it doesn't require any specific intention or belief - it's pretty much dumb-mechanical - but it gets you thinking about how it is possible, and helps flatten your concept of "experiencing the world" into something more like an "imagination room".

Next up: *Two Glasses Exercise*

The Mirror-gazing Method & The Act is The Fact

The mirror technique that began /r/DimensionalJumping/ (described below), which follows a traditional approach to detaching one's attentional focus to permit a formatting shift.

THE MIRROR METHOD

This is the original mirror-gazing method by /u/Korrin85 which kicked off the subreddit:

- First things first, you're going to need a mirror. The bigger the mirror the better. If you could theoretically walk through it all the better. It helps out a lot.
- Best times to do this are at night. Most success happens at around 12-3, although you can still do it in the day time. Just harder.
- Turn off all the lights, get rid of as much noise as possible, and sit facing the mirror. Have a candle between the mirror and you. Everything else around you should be dark.
- Relax, clear your mind. Concentrate on your reflection. View your reflection as another YOU. A YOU from a different place. Call out to that YOU, whether it is out loud or in your head. Concentrate on switching places with that YOU.
- It takes awhile, and some get it faster than others, but if you "shifted" from your current universe, you should feel something. Some of the signs for small shifts have been a brief feeling of movement, a moment of disorientation, or even your reflection blinking at you when you didn't blink. Bigger shifts include your reflection moving on it's own or even the feeling of you literally moving into the side. The bigger the shift, the more you feel.
- If you feel any signs, STOP! Take a few days to note any changes. They can be small, like a scar on someone that has mysteriously disappeared or something being a different color. The more you shift, the bigger the differences you see.
- Optional, but it works better if you have a "destination" in mind. For example, you can focus on you switching places with the YOU that has more money, or slightly better off in general.

An exercise to try:

The Act is The Fact - Part One: An Exercise

NOTE: I strongly recommend you don't bother thinking about this too much. Just go and do it. It works. Any ideas you might have about it are useless to you. Come back and read and contribute to the comments ***after*** *you have done the exercise.*

Although we often tend to view "dimensional jumping" or "reality shifting" as a specific event involving a particular act, in fact it is just a special case of a larger truth about the nature of experience.

In everyday life we are usually oblivious to all of this, due to inattention, or deliberately ignore it, because its implications can make us uncomfortable. However, it is to our advantage to embrace this knowledge and there are simple ways we can leverage it for easy change.

There is more to be said on that, and I'll follow this up with another post in future, but for now I'd like to encourage everyone to perform a very simple practical exercise.

Instructions: Two Glasses Exercise

Here are the instructions, which you should follow exactly:

- Choose a specific situation that you want to change, but one that you don't necessarily have much influence over.
- Decide clearly what the current situation is, and what the desired replacement situation is.
- Get two glasses.
- Get two bits of paper or labels.
- Fill one of the glasses with water.
- On the first label, write a word that summarises the current situation, and stick it to the filled glass.
- On the second label, write a word that summarises the desired situation, and stick it to the empty glass.
- With the two glasses in front of you, pause for a moment, and contemplate how your life is currently filled with the first situation, and empty of the desired situation.
- Then, when you're ready, pour the water from the first glass (the current situation) into the second glass (the desired situation), while really noticing the sounds and feeling and shifting of the water from one to the other.
- Sit back and see the glasses in their new state; allow yourself to take deep breath and feel relieved.
- Drink the water and enjoy the satisfaction of having made the desired change.
- Take off the labels, put away the glasses, carry on with your life.

One thing I'd like to emphasise is that you *will* get results here, so if you do decide to perform this exercise:

- **Please take this seriously and only choose a replacement situation that you will be happy to live with**.

The key to doing things knowingly is to change your perspective philosophically; but understanding is not required for producing an effect. You may also find the concept of "persistent realms" to be useful.

The essence of Dimensional Jumping is the leveraging of perspective-structuring metaphors and the techniques derived from them: In essence, all of these describe the same technique: detaching from the current sensory pattern, allowing a formatting shift, and triggering a replacement (either by deliberate intending or by accidental alignment via mood association).

There is no established theory of "jumping" or its mechanism, although there are numerous ways of viewing its nature. It is for readers to decide for themselves *through personal investigation and introspection* whether jumping is appropriate for them or not. An open mind combined with healthy caution is the correct mindset for all approaches targeted at the subjective experience. Never believe something without personal evidence; never dismiss something without personal evidence.

[...]

> Q1: I've always been able to make myself sick (think going home from elementary school) .. I could convince myself that I had a fever even though I was fine and then the thermometer in the nurse's office would read a temperature. I have always felt like I had some control of my world, but I never went beyond making myself sick. (What a great use of my energy!!!) So, I've been suffering from some terrible fibromyalgia like pain for about a year. My assumption has been that it's stress related since I'm fairly healthy and have a clean bill of health besides being slightly overweight. I'm also a first grade teacher and being in constant, exhausting pain is not exactly conducive to the work environment. So, I decided I would try this experiment about two weeks ago. On one glass, I wrote "pain" and the other I wrote "health". I tried to be very careful with my wording. I set my intention, did a few cleansing breaths, and poured the water. Then I moved on with my day. As of today, I have had no serious back pain since that day, and only slight tingling/aching after bending or crouching for too long at work. No feet that feel like stepping on glass. Love pats from my son don't feel like he's punching a bruise. I told my partner that even if it does come back over time, at least I had some relief!! I'm VERY satisfied with my results so far.

Hey, that's brilliant news! Really pleased to hear it! And, of course, I'm slightly amused that you spent your childhood using your "infinite powers" to make yourself sick. Kid logic eh? ;-)

> Q2: This is Wiccan spell casting 101.

For sure - or rather, it has common elements, without the unnecessary (or rather: optional) cultural baggage. It is simply meant to provide a useful experience for those who would not otherwise encounter it. (And it's a bridge to a more generalised version.)

> Q3: It's all quantum consciousness and fractal spacetime in the end :) whatever method works is what works!

Spacetime?? A mere fairytale! Those darned "quantums" do seem to get everywhere these days though. ;-)

> Q3: as above, so below

Hmm, I kinda think that phrase is a block to understanding for a lot of people, just because it immediately causes them to think in terms of a spatial relationship (even if it *is* a metaphorical one), which separates out two aspects which are not separate. But then, that's probably to take it too seriously anyway.

> Q3: A theory of everything has to include everything. ;)

And that includes the theory itself! :-)

> Q4: So this is what wicccans do to cast spells? Okay well the reason I'm asking is because I am a Christian believer but I still like to consider and ponder the thought and possibility of multiple dimensions and I personally don't believe that the two have to be mutually exclusive however, being a person of a particular faith I don't want to be practicing spell casting so that's why I was asking.

Well, they use the idea of associating objects with things within a ritual.

I see. No indeed, they don't have to be mutually exclusive at all. In fact I'd say the essence of the Christian faith is perfectly aligned with this (although we're talking New Testament God rather than Old Testament). I'd suggest that the "mechanism" behind this, such as it is, is precisely the same as that which underlies

traditional prayer. In other words, it is "with God" rather than a manipulation of the world in opposition to God.

> Q5: Hey, tried this two days ago. From all my attempts so far this exercise was the only one with results. Its not the exact solution to the unwanted situation I had in mind when I did the experiment though (it would be a huge jump, like change past events), but its a small, positive development, and it could lead to my desired situation. Nothing is yet guaranteed though, I'll have to wait a few weeks. I did it just as you described, I didn't meditate on this or thought too much about it, just decided the outcome, emptied the glasses, threw the labels in the trash and forgot about it for a couple hours. Later that day I received some good news about my problem. Should I keep doing it or once is enough?

That's good news! Once is enough, because the change has now made. It's like changing the TV to a channel that will be showing your favourite show. Once you've switched channel, you don't have to *keep* switching channel - it's done. Now you just have to carry on pottering about until the show comes on.

> Q6: Interestingly, the ideas you propose here are consistent with the writings of physicist Max Tegmark, which you perhaps may already know. However, he does not go so far as to suggest that it is a phenomenon that can be tested and/or manipulated. I.e. he proposes that the basic substance of our universe is a sort of mathematical object, but stops there and does not make the final step to equating that object with the Akashic Record.

Yes, I've read some of Tegmark's work with interest (and he's an entertaining guy). *It's been a while, so apologies if I'm misrepresenting his approach.*

From memory, where I'd differ is that he still views the universe as a "thing" and that it is "made from" structures which have an independent existence, and his treatment of consciousness as a state within that. There we, once again, take the information processing metaphor as "real" and independent, and place consciousness within that. The universe still seems to be a "place" rather than a idea or pattern which formats experience. Tom Campbell takes a similar approach, although he *does* suggest that intention can select outcomes; it's just that he binds himself with the concepts of probabilities and rulesets, as if they are independent system properties "out there", and implies intelligence in that beyond ours.

In our approach, we recognise that all narratives are abstract and arbitrary; they are experiences like any other. There is no fundamental structuring at all - except what we adopt *as* consciousness. We are intelligent, patterns are "dumb". And that's why we can test and manipulate it - we've got it the right way around. Recognising ourselves as unstructured consciousness which has "taken on the shape of" particular patterns, we are free to "shape-shift" in order to change state and select the form of subsequent experiences.

The problem is that this requires some faith of a sort: You have to actually *do* a "shift" in order to experience a state change and thereby prove to yourself that patterns are arbitrary. If you try to work this out intellectually from your current view, or investigate without actually intending results, you'll just continue to have experiences from your current state - confirming your current state.

That's why there's the *Two Glasses Exercise* above and the *Owls Of Eternity* synchronicity exercise. Easy stuff that hopefully gives people the experience. Then they can play with reformatting themselves with whatever "active metaphor" they're attracted to (Hall of Records, Infinite Grid, Imagination Room, etc).

I think if Tegmark (or we) reinterpreted his description as "experiential formatting" then it could be quite a powerful enabling metaphor.

> Q6: What I like about Tegmark is that his work on the multiverse points to something about consciousness and reality that lies beyond the common material assumptions that most people hold. Probably beyond those that most physicists hold (can't say for sure ... I studied advanced physics in college, but I eventually moved on to biology/medicine). But his approach is still very material, and seems to miss the obvious follow-up question: what is the substrate for the (presumably eternal) mathematical object that houses our multiverse?

Yes, that's the thing. Tegmark essentially gets to the "patterning" approach, but then insists that those patterns are somehow "external" (the problem with all simulation and information models). If he just made the step to saying that these patterns are modulations of consciousness, that there is no "underlying", he'd be pretty much there. I can understand why he'd be reluctant to do so though. (He's also bound by viewing the world as a "place" I think.)

Other physicists such as David Bohm have gone there - as did many of the early 20th century physicists. But at some point there's risen the tendency to confuse our abstractions as being objects rather than narratives. (See Mermin.)

Sam Harris is okay as an engaging speaker, but he doesn't really get to the bottom of it. His conception of self is of "this person" but he doesn't follow it through and arrive at the context of experience. I think he confuses "consciousness", "consciousness-of" and "self-consciousness" - which is why "awareness" is a better word perhaps for the "non-material material whose only property is being-aware". He then ends up in a corner when it comes to things like free will.

We have to remember that this crosses over deeply into philosophy, and neuroscientists tend not to be that well-versed, and even with the physicists there seems to be a trend towards ignorance of the fact that all models have an implied philosophy whether recognised or not. A better bet in my view is cognitive scientist Donald Hoffman's take, with interface theory and conscious realism. It still implies an "external environment" of some sort which I disagree with, but the rest of the picture is interesting. (If you get rid of space, there can only be internal environments - or actually, "dissolved" environments.)

Yeah, it is the ultimate mind food... with mind as its ingredients!

> Q6: Could this method work for any change? Any significant change?

Potentially any change, although this method is going to generally produce results by "plausible if very unlikely" means. In other words, that's a pretty big discontinuous change for this zero-prep approach! Although you'll tend to get results of "some sort" anyway even for "impossible" things.

> Q7: Question -- can you change a past event with this method? I truly believe that all events, possibilities, experiences to infinity are concurrently happening. There is a singularity where everything comes from ... everything that could/has/will happen on every level macro to micro is all going on at the same time. We (or I) seem to choose one "time stream" to exist in. It would make sense that I could "jump" to a dimension where a past event never happened and my reality changes to reflect that.

Well, the above method is intended to be a demo that gives "plausible if very unlikely" results, although people *have* used it for rule-breaking outcomes. Give it a go.

In terms of your model, I'd throw away the notion that everything is *happening* at the same time and that there are time streams and so on. Throw away the idea of an unfolding world, and instead go for something quite static. Perhaps go with something like:

- Every possible "moment" of experience is present in your perception right now, like an infinite stack of photographs of the world, all being displayed simultaneously.
- However, they are of different intensities.
- The intensity of a "moment" dictates its contribution to your experience.
- The "moment" you are experiencing now is the "brightest" in the stack.
- The "moments" you have previously experienced are still quite bright and shape your ongoing experience.
- To change the so-called past is really to reduce the brightness of a particular moment, now, so that it is contributing less to your ongoing experience.

So, a stack of photographs (or more generally: patterns or facts), each contributing to your experience, change the relative intensity to change your apparent world.

> Q8: Just did the 2 glasses experiment. I have a lot of anxiety so labeled my first glass and current situation as "anxious" and the desired outcome "less anxious". I will check back if I notice changes. A question though, is there a limit to how many times you can do this exercise on the same situation perhaps altering it slightly? How many times can you do this exercise for different situations in your life? Thanks!

You should do it once for a situation, and then let it settle out. If you keep doing it repeatedly for the same situation, you are just constantly changing state. Remember: the change happens at the moment you do the exercise; it's just that the you don't necessarily encounter the evidence until later. In other words, future events are set in place when you do the exercise.

There's no limit to how many times you apply the exercise for different situations - but you should perhaps leave a gap between each use, because things might get a bit unstable if you do it a lot, without letting things settle a bit after each time.

When you want a change, then *something else has to change too*, and there will always be some collateral shifting to keep the world coherent and "plausible". And that's a good thing. Generally, if you're feeling superstitious like that, just have the additional background intention that things should work out the best for everyone. But your real problem is that you are full of "whatiffery". *But what if this or that.* Well, what if something really great happens?

When it comes to this stuff, you shouldn't be planning or second-guessing at all. You simply do the exercise, then consider it done at that moment and carry on with your life - the results will *come to you*. Really, you should start treating all your thoughts as direct interactions with the world. Don't spend time *deliberately* thinking anything that you don't actually want. Passing thoughts are fine; they're just fleeting ripples. But to *intentionally* think stuff you don't want, would be... an error.

Y'know, all of the religions and magickal traditions have some concept of "faith" or "surrender" - this is what they mean. You have to simply *trust* that, although you can't see beyond the horizon of the present moment, that your intentions have already been incorporated and will come to you when the appropriate context arises. ***Trust it.*** (There's really no other solution.)

You should be careful what you wish for, and choose carefully. "Diligent" (conscientious, attentive, productive when required) definitely sounds like a better idea than "hardworking" (swamped by obligations?). Be mindful of the village girl, in terms of being specific.

> **The village girl who only spoke the truth.**
>
> The villagers asked her: "Will there be a plentiful harvest this year?", she responded "Yes!". That summer a great plague fell upon the village, killing many, and indeed the harvest was plentiful that year - relative to the number of mouths to feed.

The distinction between you and a distraction, between one part of your experience and another, persists it. For as long as one part is perceived as "other" then direct intervention doesn't do anything.

On "faith" - it's a ruined word now, but Neville Goddard's use is about right: it's an "assuming" or "knowing" that something is the case. The process works, simply use it.

When you turn a door handle, you push the door simply assuming it will now open. If you later notice the door has become closed again, you simply turn the door handle and open it once more. In the same way, when we make an adjustment to the world, when we put it into a certain state, if we notice it has drifted or reverted, we merely return it to that state. At some point, the door stays open, the state becomes fixed.

Now my question is...do I have to stop thinking about our lost friendship for a while? Do I keep my mind as blank as possible for the next couple of days?

Just *know that it is already done*. You have *literally* updated the state of the world by doing this exercise, and you will encounter the evidence of this in good time. Would you think about something that was already a done deal? No, because thinking is for things which are uncertain or regretful. Passing thoughts are fine, they are just like leg twitches. Would you obsess over a leg twitch? No, it's just a passing distraction. So treat thoughts about this area like that - dismiss them with an "it is already done!" and continue with whatever it is you are doing.

Aside - you should never *deliberately spend time thinking* about anything unless it is for the purpose of inserting that thought-pattern into the world, because that is what you are doing. So, all of the above is the reason why the last instruction is to "carry on with your life"!

It's fine if such a thought arises, just appears in your mind, and you let it pass. But you shouldn't *deliberately* think it. Don't get hung up on this though! First of all, why would you do that anyway? It's a superfluous act. Talking to yourself like that surely isn't healthy. ;-)

In this particular context though, you are making a declarative statement of fact which, by its nature, activates the extended pattern associated with it. *This happens automatically since it is required for the statement to have meaning.*

If you say "I wish we were close friends again" you are literally triggering the experiential pattern of "wishing you were close friends again", which implies the fact of not being close friends. You are persisting the state of "wishing" and of "not being close friends".

This complication is why the exercise is constructed in the way it is; it avoids all this formulation stuff and just accesses states directly, shifting their intensities.

Summary -

- Statements are not just observations, they are *assertions* which trigger the corresponding state, intensifying its contribution to your experience.
- Do not engage with any thoughts which arise that are contrary to your desired state - don't fight them or explore them, just let them pass.

Factual Updates and Collateral Shifts

If the world is a continuous and coherent pattern, a blanket of material with folds as facts, then you can't adjust one fact without tugging a little on the rest of the material, impacting the other folds. Although these "collateral shifts" would make sense in terms of the fundamental nature - the blanket - they wouldn't follow the logic of the world's apparent content - the folds. For instance, your car tumbles off the side of the road but - *flash!* - suddenly it didn't happen after all. Changing that fact inevitably results in a collateral shift of the world as a whole. But it takes the form of, say, an extra tin of fruit in your kitchen cupboard, a news reporter's hair being parted at the other way, and an acquaintance you've not seen in 10 years now never existed. Those changes are *causally* linked to, but not *logically* linked to, the event.

Quite possibly you would never encounter these updated facts. However, the change in your *felt-sense* of things - that "global summary" sensation that you have - might mean that the world sort of "tastes" different subsequently. You intuitively know that you are no longer in the same place. There's a different "flavour" to your life after the accident somehow.

You can try it for anything you want, there's no danger with it because it doesn't attempt to force a change - things will seem to appear by "plausible if very unlikely" routes. You can't tell in advance how it will play out, but you always get results of *some* sort. Give it a go and see what happens. (But do follow the instructions.)

> Q9: When do you think there will be a part two?

My thought was to leave a few months after the first post. The idea is that the second post goes more into the concept behind it and, from there, where else you can take it.

If I did the follow-up too early though, people would be less likely to blindly follow the two glasses instructions, and would try to second guess themselves "doing it right". Without the further discussion, there can be no danger of confirmation bias in terms of having a theory of what, exactly, is meant to happen; it's easier to be honest with oneself.

The second part will point out the relative arbitrariness of actions, and the primacy of assigned meaning. I've already ended up talking about it in discussions under other posts really, but want to gradually build up a set of posts which are look-unable, from me and others. Swift response = distraction from tedious other project. :-)

The essentials are something like (haven't got the exact wording here):

- *Shift = Detachment + Intention + Act*
- The assignment of meaning to an act is what gives it casual power.
- Experiences gain causal power through accumulated meaning, establishing habits.

Yes, detachment is the vital thing - or better said more recently, perhaps: non-attachment. This amounts to:

- Ceasing to interfere with the shifting of state or the unfolding of experience.

If you are completely open to shifts, then you get to "just decide" change - simply intend. Of course, if you want any stability to your experience at all, then you don't want to completely eliminate all structure. So it's more about adopting an "active metaphor" (a metaphor which acts as a base patterning on your experience), such as the imagination room, which provides flexibility but still enforces a high level of coherence.

Remember, this is about a change of state of the world - and since "the world" also contains your body, then that is part of the shift. Your experience is local and your intention here applies globally, but global changes can also involve immediate local changes.

A guideline proposed before for this exercise has been: "for outcomes that are *plausible but perhaps very unlikely*". In other words, they must make logical sense in the world - no discontinuities against the physical "habits of the world" - but can correspond to very remote chances within that boundary.

The word comes from your own contemplation of the situation. You think about the situations, and ask yourself what words best captures those, feel appropriate, and then use them. This is *not* about "sending a message to the universe", so it's not about writing a description of what you want (like to Santa Claus, spoilers: Santa is not *quite* real). Rather, the words are "handles" onto the situational patterns that are dissolved into the background right now.

The exercise in this post is really about shifting specific personal situations in your current world-pattern. Which is not to say you won't get a result if you use broader terms, but the effects may not be quite what you had in mind... Have you looked up persistent realms? If you just want a quick look-see of what dramatic alternatives would be like, without disconnecting permanently, that's the way to do it.

It begins:

> **What is a persistent realm?**
>
> It's a term I use to describe certain kinds of dreams I have. Dreams that are persistent, meaning where your actions have consequences, dreams you can resume each night where you left off.
>
> So why do I call them "realms"? Well, for me these kinds of dreams are a bit more than just persistent. There are a few more unique characteristics to them:
>
> *Persistence* - When you "enter" a realm, you "resume" the dream where you left of last time. (more or less)
>
> *Consequences* - Because of the persistence, every action you take has consequences. If you change something it will remain changed forever. For example, people will remember you and the conversations you've had with them.

> *Laws & Dream Powers* - A realm has a set of laws of physics (fitting the setting of the realm), which may be different from waking life. There may be ways to cast magic for example. You can learn, understand, use (and abuse) these laws, but you can never do anything that violates them. (Such as using dream powers) If a character does something ridiculous then it means that there is a law enabling him to do so, and you most likely can learn to do the same thing.
>
> *Realism* - Those dreams feel pretty damn real. I assume the main reason behind this (besides the technique I use) is that all dream characters are intelligent. You won't encounter the typical "derpy" DC who seems completely lost. DC's are intelligent and follow their own agenda. Their actions can be completely unexpected.

It then continues at length. You'll find a nice overlap between the poster's ideas for creating realms and experiences, and some of the approaches we discuss here. Which makes sense of course: **this world is an immersive, persistent realm too.**

Neville Goddard works but really there's a more general sense in which you can work with this. If you just want out completely, then it's worth your time playing with the persistent realms idea. I see suicide as the ultimate in "undirected jumping" and is absolutely not recommended.

Of course, what you should *really* do is stop engaging with this aspect of your experience - because the more you get yourself all irritated and annoyed about the direction of this stuff, the more it's going to whirlwind around you in an ever-accelarating storm of synchronicity...

Anything within your subjective experience (which means: everything really) is up for grabs. For this exercise, the nature of transition will tend to be "plausible". The main point here is to demonstrate something to yourself, something essential about the nature of your experience.

> > Q10: Question: should I continue to revise my day as Neville Goddard has suggested after doing this, or would that be considered interfering?

That's an interesting question, and I guess it depends a little. But in general I'd say go ahead, that's fine, because the exercise above should in any case about situations which are a bit more remote from your immediate influence. When revising the day you are looking at the specific subjective scenes which unfolded, rather than the larger world. For instance, revising the scene where you argued with your brother at his house isn't going to affect the pattern associated with that business deal in Ohio – etc.

> > Q10: So even if my focus of the two glass experiment was a better relationship with my brother, revision would be more of a help than hindrance?

I'm suggesting that you do the exercise for your relationship with your brother, then let it play out (knowing that it's sorted) and *don't* micro-revise that relationship. (I mean, you'd rather just have a good relationship, right?) Instead save revision for "course correction" of things like reversing a bad meeting at work, etc. That way you are changing the situation as a whole, as well as properly demonstrating the approach to yourself too.

You know, for lucid dreaming you basically just have to fully commit to the fact that you are a lucid dreamer. You can use something like the two glasses to play with that, but you need to then let it be (which you might not find so easy for this).

> Q11: question, I'm seriously thinking about trying this out.. there's this girl I really like we used to talk but things didn't work out for some odd reason? She just stopped talking to me it was so sudden. Long story short she's with another guy now but I cant stop thinking what could have been if we had dated. so what I'm wondering is if I were to put "She doesn't talk to me" and "She wants me" on the cups, is that sufficient? or do I have to be more specific and put her name and what not.

What matters is what the labels mean for you. They don't need to be detailed, they just need to capture the essence of it for you. You aren't "sending messages to the universe" here; you are basically attaching those world-states to the glasses.

I would make a suggestion here: you should be more clear about your actual target situation. Is it *really* that you want her to want you? She can do that and you'll never know about it. Or do you actually want her to be your girlfriend? Your labels could be (choose your own, this is just my examples): "Estranged" and "Together" or something like that.

Yes, every time you do the exercise, since you are approaching it with different situations in mind (and on labels), it's a "fresh" event. But it's best to leave some settling time between sessions, like a week after each one, I'd suggest.

The whole point is that it makes a great demo exercise just to see if there's "anything going on with this stuff". So try it on something like a personal situation that you'd like sorted, but which you have limited power over, and isn't too intense - and see what happens. It's better to play with these things *before* you really need them. There's a tendency for people to suddenly go "hey I need to sort out this really important thing", which makes it harder to follow the last instruction.

Perhaps the way to think of it is, that this is an *acceleration of change*. Rather than plodding across the existing landscape for a year to get to the mountain with your prize on it, the landscape *compresses* and you get there in a week. There may be a period of bumps (you're covering a year's terrain in 7 days) but to say that *not* taking control is more risky than *making an actual decision* isn't very convincing? You'll always have regrets. If they are certain, better to get to them sooner rather than later. If they are not certain, than making conscious decisions is the way to avoid them. (Anyway: I think most people report regretting what they *didn't* do rather than what they did do.)

I meant regrets in life, rather than as a result of doing the exercise! There will always be "collateral shifts", because if you want things to change then, well, things have to *change*. Unfortunately (but also marvellously) you can't know the shape of the landscape until you encounter it - and you are the only knower.

All of this stuff applies *anyway* to your life, it's just that when you start investigating things such as this, you become properly conscious of them - the mystery aspect, and that every intention moves *the whole world*. But at least when you intend deliberately, you *choose*. Right now, you're walking across a landscape that you made accidentally and clumsily.

There's really nothing to worry about. And with a tool at your disposal which can help you and others, life can only get better surely.

So, yeah: follow the last instruction (carry on with your life; results come to you, so there's nothing to be done) and give it a while to settle out

> Q13: nothing (well *not* nothing) ... not *much* has changed

What does that mean, more precisely?

> Q13: My financial life hasn't changed the way i directed for it too be, intentionally, visually. Maybe i need to continue creating, sometimes i just feel like giving up since i don't see the occurrences changing, but then again **whats the point of giving up if theres nothing to lose**.

Suggestion: maybe initially go for something tangible, a specific thing or situation, rather than something as abstract as money?

I think that no matter what your approach to getting something, you need to conceive of it as a lived situation from your own subjective perspective. Whatever you seem to want, what you actually want is one or more *experiences*, whether that's an audio-visual experience which implies a desirable fact, or an ongoing experience of a feeling which implies you are in a particular state. So, it is important when setting targets (everyday goals or more esoteric things) to frame them positively: in the sense that they are formulated as an actual thing you could live as a moment as a *moving-towards*, rather than an abstract concept or a *pushing-away* from something.

The way to think of this is that you are selecting subjective experiences for yourself. And this of course means that you can select experiences *of other people changing and getting better*. Typically, I'd allow some settling out time after each use of the exercise; couple of weeks maybe. The original idea of the exercise was as a demonstration to show that there is "something going on", with minimal effort, so it's a kind of "fire and forget" approach. It just so happens that it's a handy tool also.

It says that because the idea is that this is a "demonstration" exercise, and so if the situation is fairly specific, it's easier to decide whether there was a result (to show "there's something going on"). There's no actual restriction on what you can choose, though.

> Q14: Hey. For a few years now I hated how different I was from everyone, just weird. So just now I did this exercise. I wrote weird on one cup and normal on the other. I hope everything really works.

Maybe they'll all suddenly realise that *they* were the weird ones all along. ;-)

> Q14: Haha I hope

Seriously, though: Don't worry too much about being "weird", especially if you're still at school or starting out in life, because later you'll look back on those "normal" people as being *the boring people*, and you'll discover more interesting people who overlap with you more. If there's something I'd recommend, it's learning how to be *calm and relaxed*, to be able to step back a little from things as they are happening, which will let you be *more yourself*. When people judge themselves as being "weird", sometimes what they really mean is that they're *nervous* and this causes them to behave a little hysterically in response to social situations - because they are not trusting or allowing their spontaneous selves to flow. (I don't know whether that is your situation; it just occurred to me to offer a viewpoint just in case.)

> Q15: So I did this exercise 2 days ago, is this similar to casting a sigil? I use to try casting sigils a few months ago and none of them worked :(

Only in the sense that it attaches meaning to sensory objects, but of course there's a commonality to all these sorts of things.

If sigils didn't work, can I ask: did you play with the situation mentally at all after you had cast the sigil?

> Q15: I did play with them mentally in a way. I was very open minded for how the things would come about happening, and I could see possible routes for the things occurring everywhere, but none of them really came about.

Really, you should leave them alone. Once you've done the act, simply get on with your life knowing that the work is done and it'll show up. You should think of your thoughts as *literally* pulling and pushing on the world. And unfortunately, if you start pulling up that "part" and thinking about different routes and even having doubts, you are potentially reshaping that part accordingly. That's like having spontaneously created a schedule by intention (albeit one you can't see) and then keeping changing your mind on what you want and how you want it, so that the schedule keeps revising itself.

One problem is that *every* intentional act is a world-changing magical act. Lots of people are actually just spontaneous in their daily life, they don't "interfere" with it much (don't even know they could), and so the occasional intervention takes effect and then doesn't get undone.

Meanwhile, others - ironically, often those who are interested in the topic and pursuing it deliberately - are constantly unwittingly "redirecting" themselves, wrestling with their world. So they fire of a sigil or whatever, but don't realise they are effectively doing constant "re-sigilising" through their world-focused thinking process.

Which is why I think it's a benefit to everyone to practice a daily releasing exercise, and then "stop generating". Learning how to, say, stand up from a chair without doing anything. It teaches you how to intend a state-change only when desired.

It can be difficult because you want to *do something* to *make* things happen - feel some sort of mental or physical effort going on. But that's just the intentional generation of the experience of effort; it has nothing to do with making the desired changes! Hopefully I'll have time this weekend to sit down at a desk and bash out the second part. The idea is that it will link the experiment (which amounts to ritual really) to the larger view of patterns and meaning and metaphor and so on.

Meditation can be good, but really I'd practice this: lie down on the floor in the constructive rest position (knees up, feet flat, books supporting the head) and *play dead*. Let go of controlling your body, your mind but most importantly: *your attention*. Let them shift and move and unwind as they want. Whenever you find yourself holding onto your focus again, cease to do so. In other words: "stop generating" and allow the pattern of experience to flow as it wants.



It corresponds to an ideal balanced posture - no residual muscular effort required to maintain it, fully supported. It's pretty much the only way to have your neck muscles release. (And it has to be the floor really, or a very sturdy mat, definitely not a bed.)

You'll feel it when you do it. There's initial discomfort because you are residually "holding yourself in the air" but when that settles out it can be super-relaxing. (10 minutes, twice a day, or whenever you are stressed.)

Ambitious is fine, although because this particular experiment doesn't force anything, your result will happen by "plausible if unlikely" routes. In other words, there will arise "apparently reasonable excuses" for what you to get what you want. Anyway, this is an interesting one to watch happen. Yeah, the "something is up" period is fascinating. There's still the urge to try and make things happen by somehow doing them; like you can use your muscular tension or effortful frown to assist you. You know *something* is going on but it's still not clear *how, exactly*. There may be a squirrel or two to go...

> > Q15: Haha yes, the muscular one will be interesting to see happen. However, my pouring into the "Billionaire" cup will be even more interesting to watch unfold ;) Especially because I'm a programmer who makes apps, which makes it completely within the realm of possibility that it happens. I have a theoretical situation for you. Say a regular, ordinary person with 0 knowledge of oneirosophy/DJ/insert-metaphor finds your post and performs this experiment. Are you confident that they will achieve their replacement situation? Or is it required for one to know at least "something is up" before getting results?

Theoretical Situation - They get the best results! Everyone else who thinks they have some knowledge of "how it all works" subtly tries to manipulate themselves, or help it along, or work out what's *really* happening. This is one of the reasons I came up with that particular formulation: it's not so easy to make sense of it, even if you have thought about this stuff before, unless you've been pondering raw pattern/meaning activation. Of course, once you know the underlying, you can go directly for it, but it requires a level of bloody-mindedness. Just as you can't "sorta, maybe" lift your arm, you have to follow through and not re-edit the world before it happens, so it is with this. *You are interacting with the world directly.*

The Billionaire's Cup - Hmm. Being into programming and creative stuff is good, just in terms of allowing things to happen, because opportunities can come from nowhere *and* still be plausible. Most people find that easier than getting that inheritance from a long lost uncle or whatever. Even though, of course, everyone has a *potential* long lost uncle; they've just not called him into experience yet...

You simply need to do something which *means-that* you have returned (are returning) your world-pattern to the desired state. You can reperform the experiment, or perhaps mentally recall the final state of the experiment and the feeling you had, or just superimpose *"RELOAD"* over the scene before you with the intention that you are loading up the state again. But this is only a problem if, after realising what you've been doing, you *think-that* you've undone it.

The whole "faith" thing is about realising that since changes are direct and immediate, creation is "already done" at that moment. It's definitely best you can commit and so stop tinkering; the exercise in the post is meant to avoid that crossing your mind (because you probably don't have access to the pattern anyway).

> > Q15: this method would seem much less powerful in comparison to the immediate "asserting" methods.

Completely right! The origin of this exercise is *purely* to get people to witness a result with zero effort or interest at all; you don't need to commit to "jumping" or any other metaphor. Although the pattern of change is implemented immediately here as always, it is overlaid upon whatever other patterns have already been accumulated, so you will see it only when the context allows it to "shine through", as it were. You aren't gripping the world in the same way as you do with other methods.

Where its advantage lies (apart from not needing any practice at all) is that having done this, you gain direct knowledge of how your entire experience and every intentional act you perform works the same way. You realise there is *no technique*. It's simply a matter of how specific and strong the intention - and not re-intending subsequently. If by simply pouring some water while simultaneously summoning the pattern of a state you can bring it about, it makes you realise: a) how powerful you are specifically and, b) how cautious you should be generally.

Personally, I would not think in terms of "dimensions" except as a powerful metaphor - as in, if your experience shifts dramatically it is equivalent to being in a different "dimension". You will never have any experience outside of "your reality", so any change that happens is basically a modification of that.

This *particular* exercise should be thought of as a way to change a situation in your life without having to get bogged down in any theory!

There are no restrictions here, only choices. For the purposes of this, think of yourself as having your own "private view" of the world. You can have any experience you want in your private view, since it's your "personal slice" of the infinite gloop. Nobody can stop it. *Anything* can happen. Go for it.

If you feel you've left yourself with doubt - if you don't feel satisfied - then you can repeat it, just so that you can comfortably feel that you completed it, and move on.

As it says in the instructions, you want to be able to allow yourself to take a breath and feel relieved at the end - and then you can just move on (because you've already made the change).

> Q16: so I wrote a phrase

That's fine. I say "word" in the instructions to prevent people writing extended descriptions, rather than calling up the essence of it. The effort to encapsulate it helps, since it corresponds to identifying and accessing it. Things tend to happen pretty quick (in fact, the underlying change to the world occurs upon completion of the exercise). How soon you encounter the evidence of that obviously depends on the particular situation.

Look forward to hearing your results once they're in.

> Q17: I have a family member who drinks too much and its negatively affecting my desire to be around him. Is this act applicable to such a situation? What is the implication of another's free will here?

Yes, that is a suitable situation. The free will discussion is somewhat tangled, but trust me that you don't need to worry about. It all works out. As an easy way to think about things: consider this to be "your copy of the world". Wouldn't you want to make it the best world it can be, with everyone in it becoming the best version of what they can be? Any action which supports that outcome is a morally good one, and your intention sounds like it fits in nicely.

So maybe think of the "end situation" as being one where the family member is sober and also much happier as a result. That way everyone benefits.

You could drink it if it feels right to do so, symbolically. Since, part of the point of this is to prove there's "something going on", I'd take on particular situation and let it play out completely, until you know it is done. (Thing take a while to settle.) Then armed with the knowledge you've gained, you can choose how you manage it from then on.

Yes, best to just leave things to run their course over a while (it depends a little on the request). Passing thoughts are fine, but you should not deliberately attend to them or create them, I suggest; let them rise and fall, and go about your business.

As a demo exercise, it's generally best suited to personal situational things with the possibility of "plausible if very unlikely routes" rather than discrete factual shifts - but if you do it, you *will* get an appropriate result of some sort. I mean, just try it and see.

Since part of this is to prove to yourself that "something is going on", I would choose one situation, do it, let the results come in, let the world settle out again. After all, what's the hurry? If it wasn't for this post you wouldn't even have the option. And why would you start stirring your reality around with a technique you hadn't properly investigated yet? You get the idea. (This is fun stuff, but it should also be taken very seriously.) Yep, so, pick one situation first and follow it through!

> Q18: This seems to work for people? I wonder if it works because of the symbolism -- the representation of one turning into another makes one "feel" that the act is the exact same thing AS the desired outcome. Hard for me to explain, but the act of going from one to the other in such a literal and sensory way is believed by the person to represent the same thing AS changing from one state to the other. The belief of the person is where the "magic" seems to be. You are basically altering your reality operating system by tweaking some of the software settings from glass #1 to glass #2 -- and you need to actually "do something" to convince yourself "something" is really changing. That's how I see it...I can't come up with something I want to try yet...

The general idea is right, but you're right it's not easy to describe. It's not belief or convincing or representation, although we can use these as clumsy metaphors for something that is actually more direct. Rather than those, I'd say that we are deliberately entangling one pattern with another (via declaration or assignment of meaning), so that by manipulating one pattern, we are manipulating the other.

If you think of the full definition of the world as being one continuous pattern, then it's like you are attaching sensory "handles" to parts of that pattern, such that moving the handles shifts the pattern.

The same applies to your everyday habits. You move your arm using exactly the same process. Snappy bullet points from elsewhere:

- *Act + Intention + Detachment = Shift*
- Assigning a meaning to an act is what gives it causal power.
- Assigning a meaning to any experience can give it causal power.
- Habitually observed cause-effect relationships are the outcomes of previous assignments or associations.

An important thing to realise is that all of experience, all of the world, is "within you", even though only part of the world-pattern is "sensorily bright" at any one moment. So what's actually happening is that you are "shape-shifting" your own state.

Always tricky this because (as you will have noticed!), I'm not you - so I can only rely on your own observations. A couple of thoughts though anyway: Typically, you always get a result *in some form*. If you are in a particularly constrained state (you are resisting the pattern shift), the available contexts for things to shine through might be restricted to being symbolic for now, and literal appearance with quite a delay. (If you play with this more, you'll be surprised at how things you did without committing, crop up in odd circumstances with large delays.)

If a situation is stressful and you are obsessing with it, then that can be like constantly re-intending your state. It's hard to follow the last instruction ("put the glasses away and carry on with your life") in that case. The wording of the instructions is in a particular way to try to avoid triggering the person into becoming too self conscious during the exercise or afterwards.

Truly, when you do the exercise, that is the literal updating of the world, in a deliberate way - but understandably it's hard not to 'tinker' mentally with things that matter to us. That's why it's billed as a demo exercise: it's easier to prove things to yourself initially if results are kinda optional, and then have more faith in the process later.

Keep playing with it, I'd suggest. The best way is to treat it as a bit of fun and, having proved to yourself that there's "something going on", then you can take it more seriously (or not). I just find this sort of thing interesting, and it's nice if a bunch of us can explore together, gain some insights, and maybe have some adventures along the way.

I think something to bear in mind is: at this point, we are not starting from scratch. We have accumulated lots of observations, and the implicit facts that go with them. Just as a dream begins with hypnagogic imagery and then becomes more coherent and stable, we might view our experiences as a very established and highly-structured dream.

This is good, this structure, because if every thought you had created an instantaneous shift, you'd be screwed, but it does mean the direct sense of causation by intention is less clear. Which is fine... we need some coherence, and we get mystery and excitement along with it.

The whole mystery of life is that, by analogy, when you take two patterns and lay them on top of each other, you can't anticipate the resulting pattern prior to experiencing it. You can choose what patterns to add, but you can never tell exactly what the resulting experience will be overall - especially since you don't know what's gone into the mix before. So I don't think there is a "force" - as in, an intelligent separate conscious entity which is "happening" - but there is certainly a lot of structure that has been amassed, and on top of that is our (prior) ignorance about the nature of the relationship between the intentions and actions and subsequent experiences.

There is also the issue that, if you do start thinking that there is an external force, you'll very quickly start having experiences "as if" there was one - until you start thinking of it as a mechanism, when it'll switch to that instead.

The exercises here try to dodge this problem by misdirection (in terms of the glasses exercise) or by directly going for patterning (the owls exercise, and then the actual patterning-imagination approaches), so as to minimise bringing implied mechanisms into play.

> Q18: At what point do we start 'creating' our own experience? when we were first conceived, or when we were born? If, for instance, we started 'collecting' and 'creating' patterns when when we were first born, how did we come into existence through the patterns of 'birth' and 'existence' prior to when we first existed? In short, if we create our entire reality, how did we create ourselves prior to ourselves existing?

As you suggest, we don't create our reality in that deliberate way, event by event, pattern by pattern. It is more accurate to say that all possible patterns already exist "dissolved into the background" and that what changes (as a result of intention) is the relative contribution of those patterns. "Creation is already done", as the phrase goes. It is eternal and timeless.

Since there is no inherent division within consciousness and it doesn't "happen" in time, when we change the distribution it is more like being a "shape-shifter" than a doer of change - i.e. it's not a case of one part altering another part. The whole pattern distribution shifts, and the pattern as a whole is what dictates experience; that is what intentional change is. Without intentional change, our sensory experiences arise consistently with and deterministically from whatever the current distribution is. Note: "time passing" is a static pattern also. In other words, the arrival of the bird in sensory experience does not represent a creation event; it is simply the encountering, arising in the senses, of that part of the pattern.

Of course, one might hypothesise an "outside" to your conscious space, and a force that is somehow impinging on it, but since you will never experience such a thing (you will only ever experience things within your unbounded conscious space), it's basically meaningless. And when we search directly, we can't find an "outside". It makes more sense to say that everything is "inside".

As a general point: all thoughts we have *about* experience are also *inside* experience. We might imagine ourselves and a force impinging on us, but both parts of that imagining are themselves inside our conscious space. It's basically a story *also* arising in consciousness. It's like being a glove-puppet trying to find hands... with the plot twist that the glove is empty!

> Q19: but i just can't get how sudden, unexpected, radically different patterns or experiences can occasionally barge into your life, if all of creation and experience is decided and modulated merely by our conscious experience of it.

There's two different things here. There is events that are already patterned, and there is shifting of state. A future dramatic event is already true *now*, in the same way as a mountain on the landscape is already there even if your hike hasn't got there yet.

A change of state, in contrast, is a reshaping of the entire landscape itself via detachment and intention. "Surrender" can lead to a radically different type of experience, mainly because it allows the landscape to relax into a rest state - and that also has the effect of reducing the thoughts which arise.

> Q: This sounds like prayer to me.

Well, I suppose prayer is basically just meaningful action - performing a mental or physical act with a specific intention in mind.

> Q: How strict are the instructions? For example, if I were to label the glasses but not stick them on and lay them in front of the glasses instead, would it count? Or is it important to be very precise? Thanks.

There's flexibility - but I'd follow them precisely really. Why not? A bit of thought has gone into each step, often for what they lead you *away* from doing, rather than what they tell you to do. Your example would likely be fine, but generally these thing complicate the association of meaning to the action.

> Q: Just did it. I'm fairly skeptical, but I followed the directions exactly. It's cliche, but I chose "Poor" and "Wealthy."

Why not, eh? Initially though - since part of the purpose is to demonstrate there's "something in this", in the spirit of conducting an experiment - I'd suggest going for something more specific, like a particular personal situation that needs resolved, or a particular thing you want. Typically, concepts such as "wealthy" are very broad and hard to judge in terms of outcome. What comes up when you say that word to yourself? For most people, it's not a very certain concept, like "money" it can be kinda meaningless without a particular context.

Something to think about anyway.

Play with it. Remember the description though: you are changing from one *situation* to another *situation*. So when you are contemplating the target state, it should be in the sense of what being in that new situation would be like. It's in that sense that you want to be specific. So, if you wanted to travel the world, that might evoke being on a boat in the ocean (rather than just an image of a map). Or if you did want to be financially well-off, it would be a certain feeling of comfort and freedom as you look at your bank account (rather than just a picture of dollars). The labels, then, are "handles" onto the situation you are intending; and what you contemplate as you perform exercise is a narrowing onto that target.

Which makes it sound more complicated than it is. Really it's about: firmly deciding what the outcome of the exercise will be like.

It's a single-user exercise for a single-user world. Poor analogy: does having more characters in a TV screen image make it more likely that the channel will change?

> Q: Also, is having "evidence" that the situation you're trying to change is fact make it harder to change? Say you have texts talking about ..say you lost your job, would keeping those texts make it harder to make it to where you didn't lose the job? (Also poor example on my part, ha)

It can help you mentally prepare I guess, if you have eradicated counter evidence, and there will be less things to shift, intuitively speaking. Really though, this isn't a "physical" thing; if you are changing or reducing the "contribution of a fact or pattern" to your ongoing experience, everything else will shift into line with that naturally. I'd say it is generally easier to have unlikely things occur *from this point on* and get back what you want that way, through a new event, just because it seems less reality-breaking and so easier to allow (deletion of "facts" forces you to confront that single-user thing directly). Or to keep those *Pruning Shears of Revision* going on a regular basis, perhaps, so that things never get out of hand.

> Q: I've been trying to search this subreddit for a link describing the "single-user" thing you mentioned, but I can't find it. Any way you can give me a link to that thread?

Oh, that was just a phrase I was using to illustrate the point. Essentially: you *are* your own copy of the world, amounting to a private slice of the "infinite gloop", a personal set of facts. Maybe check out *The Patterning of Experience* and *The Imagination Room*, *The Hall of Records*, perhaps.

[...]

The *labeled glasses* represent (or are "handles" to) the situations or states. The *water* represents (or is linked to) their relative intensity or contribution. Pouring the water *from* the "current" glass *to* the "desired" glass is a shifting of state from one to the other - thus diminishing the intensity of the current pattern and increasing the intensity of the desired pattern.

> Q: Didn't work for a believer. I went into this fully believing it would work, and I made sure to follow every step to the letter. My situation was a girl at school I had completely fallen for, but she wasn't so keen on me. The words I chose were "Distance" and "Love" I went through the method, with everything checking out except that, even though I focused, I didn't see or hear anything special about the movement of water. Even so I drank the water, was fully satisfied, and put the glasses away. It's been almost a week and I've gotten no positive results, so where did I go wrong? Thanks.

First off, belief doesn't really matter *as such*. It only matters in that if you believe in something you will fully commit to an act rather than holding back, and if you believe in something you won't spend all your time thinking the opposite. Basically, belief "works" only in the sense of promoting *non-resistance* or *aligned action* (mental or physical), rather than as a causal mechanism. Meanwhile, you don't need to necessarily have any sort of obvious experience when you do the exercise - there *may* be felt shift in that moment, but the change you want is really a pattern mapped out into subsequent experiences, so there's no need to worry about that. Note that the instructions intentionally avoid going into descriptive detail, because the "spontaneous" approach to the instructions is likely to be the right one.

With all that said - let's explore. Without leading you, let me ask: how did you come to choose those words?

> Q: I suppose it would have to do with how I define them. I labeled the current situation as "Distance" because that is how I could accurately sum up how I felt when I thought about it. This person of interest and I seemed, well, distant, not connected, apart, etc. I chose the second word because of how I thought of love. I'm a very expressive person, so for me, the word implies intentional action, like actions that would indicate an obvious connection between you and another human. That's the best I can do to summarize how I got the words, sorry if it doesn't help, but thank you none the less!

It may be that the second word came from too general a pattern, but hard to tell when I'm not you. ;-) I'd give it another week - but be sure to just "carry on with your life" rather than mulling it over, since the results will *come to you*. Then revisit.

[...]

The idea, loosely, has been to come in at the ground floor (philosophical idealism/nondualism), treat everything beyond that as "patterning" or "active metaphors", and then generate what you might call an

intentional glitch - without having to get bogged down with the baggage of the more traditional concepts or beliefs, be they religious or esoteric (useful though they can be to some). After all, if this is how reality works, then there is nothing "special" about it, it's how things are anyway.

I really think that it's beneficial to separate out the *nature* of experiencing (the "open aware space" which is "formatted" or "patterned" into states via intention) and the *content* of experiencing (sensations, perceptions and thoughts arising from the current state or patterning). That circumvents the whole philosophy vs religion vs magick vs glitches discussion, since we see all of those as conceptual formatting and only *relatively* true, because only the "open aware space" is unchanging and *fundamentally* true. (Which does bring to mind a familiar phrase, of course, about truth and permittedness.)

Remember, this isn't a "sending a message to the universe" exercise. The words you choose aren't meant to be a complete description, they are simply meant to be single words which - if you pause and contemplate the situation - "come from" the feel of it, feel most appropriate to it. They are "handles" onto the states they are not full descriptions of the states (which in any case cannot be done). So, you've described things pretty well in that message. Perhaps words that might come to you would be: "sedate" and "fire", since you *know-that* those words *mean-that* you are referring to those states.

Since the demo exercise is intended to "show you that something is going on" - *and* you have to be able to follow the last instruction - it can be best to start with something which, while something you definitely want to happen or get sorted, isn't something you are totally obsessive about emotionally. And you can proceed from there.

(There are certainly variations you can come up with on the exercise, but remember that all that stuff is "sensory theatre" in the end; it's about connecting to states and changing their relative contribution really.)

> Q: I overlooked the first part and read through the comments, other posts, as well as r/glitchinthematrix before deciding I would try the two cups method. I then read the tip and did it anyways. I saw this as an interesting exercise and didn't really focus much on the posts. Will any of this affect the outcome? I also changed the second label to a similar word and then mispelled the second word.

Well, the first part is because the spirit of this is to show yourself that "something is going on". Avoiding reading further means you'll be less inclined towards confirmation bias and so on. It doesn't affect the exercise itself; it just means your conclusions aren't polluted by what you've picked up. Meanwhile, what matters about the labels is the states they are connected to - they are "handles" onto the situations. Misspelling is fine, if that connection was made. Anyway - just wait and see!

[...]

The words are a "handle" on the situations, they don't have to *describe* the situations. So, knowing what your current situation and your desired situation are, you pause and let the words "come to you" that are most appropriate (rather than intellectually working out what the words are). And yes, if that turns out to be someone name that's fine - since that name *means-that* the situation is one where you are associated with them, within you.

> Q: Do you happen to have read "Focussing" by Eugene Gendlin? He uses the term 'handle', which means a word, phrase or image that describes a bodily felt sense. The idea being that you get a felt

> sense regarding a situation, and then work through (at a distance) what the handle might be. When you find the correct handle, the felt sense shifts slightly, letting you know that you've found a handle that is close enough.

I have indeed! Although I use them in a slightly different way, I find both "handle" and "felt-sense" good descriptive terms (better than previous terms, e.g. "sensory folds" and "explicated aspects", for general use).

His more in-depth book, *Focusing-Oriented Psychotherapy: A Manual of the Experiential Method*, is excellent, and his "process model" stuff is interesting. As I recall, he doesn't really explore the idea that this "global summary" is of the dissolved extended pattern of which specific sensory experiences are just the condensed aspects in the moment ("handles"), but his framework for experiential exploration is a great perspective on it.

I suppose I've read a lot around "this sort of stuff" - things that relate to exploring our direct experience, ways of conceptualising that, and the interrelationship between the two. Whether it's psychology, contemplative practices, acting and dancing techniques, or older traditions for intentional change, they've all got something useful to offer.

> > Q: Does the individual have to be in a certain state of mind when doing this exercise? During and after the exercise?, also if failed can I try multiple times?

No, it doesn't matter, although obviously one should clear a bit of quiet space around it, so that one is actually attending properly to what they are doing. When you do it, leave a week or two for results to appear. The change happens *at the moment of the exercise*. It is not additive so there's no benefit in repeating (when you are seated and then stand up, you can't by "more stood up" after the end point, although you could reset and repeat), however if you feel you were interfering and re-intending, there is no harm in doing it again later after things have settled. Remember to follow the last instruction.

This is primarily about exploring "the nature of experience"; that there are practical results is a pleasant side-effect. Treat it in that spirit, meaning it's not just about the results you get, it's the implications of whatever you observe. So in that sense, the exercise is always done "correctly".

[...]

The labelled glasses are linked to the situations. The words are "handles" onto the extended patterns of underlying states (suggestion: you contemplate the situations and let the worlds "come to you" from that, rather than intellectually selecting them).

> > Q: The "two glasses" experience posts are getting out of hand. I think people are obsessing over a quick remedy to their situation rather than seeing the and believing in the bigger picture. Maybe un-stick this post and post part 2.

Yeah, it's time for an update post about the larger picture, in the new year when I've got a bit of time.

Having said that, it's probably still quite educational. The exercise is deliberately constructed to lead you to an experience which is thought-provoking, and is "safe", so there's no problem with its use - provided you don't focus on anything silly.

Although: It's amazing that people will launch into making drastic changes in delicate contexts without actually doing any reading - even the sidebar or the full intro post. It's like giving someone a computer terminal and telling them that whatever they type, will become fact, but the program has its own syntax. They just start bashing away without reading the manual (okay) but not even the one page quick-start guide (hmm).

Anyway: I'd like to reestablish the balance of this stuff, in terms of being about the exploration of the nature of experience as well as creating desirable effects. The experience (getting results) without the meaning (understanding the implications) often doesn't lead anywhere particularly good. Not bad either, but getting obsessed with what's on your labels and never progressing beyond that, misses the larger point - it's meant to be a launching pad.

It has become a bit narrowed lately. I suppose it's natural, in that people are always on the look out for cheat codes without having to learn how to program (as it were). I think the subreddit needs a bit of a content injection, and I'm thinking about how best to do that.

Since the underlying idea is that models/descriptions/metaphors aren't to be *believed*, and should be viewed as "patterning", which is *itself* a metaphor, I'm just wary of putting out something which will be adopted as "how it is really", when the point is that there *is no* how it is really. Which means we really need a post or two providing some context, an expansion of the rallying call in the sidebar to never believe - to maintain the open verdict as one's default. That plus a restatement of fundamental or direct experiential truth, *vs* relative or conceptual truth. With a bit more time, I'll maybe do some redrafting of posts/comments and set up some wiki articles or mini-essays.

I have been watching *The Man in the High Castle* over the last few days! I'd already read the book, so I already know the deal with it. And yes, it is quite relevant. Actually, Philip K Dick's work is generally excellent at giving a direct feel for (so-called) reality being somewhat transparent and unstable - *Ubik* and *Flow My Tears* being particularly good for this. All fiction is potentially a path to patterning and state change, on an "as if" basis.

[...]

For sure, it's another model. I agree we're not so different in the sense that it boils down to something akin to patterns - but I think he left some dangling concepts (time and space and occurrence) and didn't quite fold it into subjective experience. But, it's all metaphors and you pick out what's useful or elegant for you. In the end, if you can think it you can usually experience it "as if" it were true, so it doesn't make sense to get overly hung up on one formulation vs another. (My own original desire was to have a concept that was as generalised as possible, and helped think in terms of direct experience and "becoming" states, so that there was no sense of remoteness, and or of something "operating" or "managing" experience. Something within which you can answer the question: what exactly is intention?)

I do find it interesting that he came from the Robert Monroe gang (some of the my earliest explorations was with that stuff). I think a lot of people in this 'business' get started by investigating that side of things.

> Q: Despite your glass example...

Alright, why don't we run through this? So, the first thing to do is to flip your perspective around on things, and then start with something simple...

Note: obviously we're not directly interacting here, so I'm just assuming it makes sense as we go. Hopefully you'll get the flavour anyway.

Generally, without really considering it, we assume that we are a little "me" sat in our heads looking out at the world. Your *actual* experience is more like: you are "an open aware conscious perceptual space" within which experiences arise as sensations, perception and thoughts. In effect, the experience you are having right now is of being a "mindspace" which has taken on the shape of *being-a-world-from-the-perspective-of a-person*. (Meanwhile, we should really say that thoughts are "shadow-sensory" perceptions, arising in this space.)

Take a moment to pause right now, and notice that you are somehow open and everywhere, and that the room and your body are sort of floating within that space. Don't *think-about* it; this is about stepping back and *noticing* your direct experience as it is. It's not something you understand or work out - it's something you just recognise as true.

Okay, **you are now enlightened.** Well done! :-)

Given this new understanding, you pause once more and consider your arm. What *is* your arm, really? It's a collection of sensations floating in space. Okay, now raise your arm...

Now, normally when people move their arms deliberately and specifically, they sort of find them and grab onto them and then move them. What they end up doing is fixing those sensations in place and then trying to *also* intend their arm into the air. But you now understand that this makes no sense: how can you grab onto and move a sensation? A sensation is a conclusion, it is not a thing.

So approach it differently. This time leave your arm alone completely. Don't both tinkering with those sensations. Instead I want you to imagine, in space, the feeling of your arm being up in the air - as if you had a "shadow arm" which you can move. Do that now, create that shadow arm position - and allow your 'real' arm to do whatever it wants. See what happens. It should be effortless and slightly disconcerting.

What you've done there is *intend* an end-state, and allow your self to shift spontaneously to that end state. We did it very simply, but it works the same way for more complex movements. And also for things which, it would seem, are not "yours". Of course, since everything arises in that "open space" that you are, *everything* is yours really - it's just a matter of whether it's presently unfolded into the senses, or dissolved into the background. Can you see where that might lead?

What's most important is to *cease to oppose* shifts in experience and in state. With a ceasing of opposition (which requires a certain trust and faith that everything naturally works out), intention - which is really a type of contextual thought, a triggering into activation of patterns - becomes experience ever more efficiently and effortlessly. Meanwhile, the glasses example is a method of attaching patterns or partial states to "external" objects, so that they can be manipulated. (Remember of course, that those so-called external objects are within you also. The glasses become *literally* connected to the extended patterns of the situations you are dealing with. The labels are effectively "handles" onto the dissolved states.)

> Q: And might I ask how you figured this out for yourself?

Like all things, it's a mixture of all the things I've read and experimented with, and restructuring it in a way that makes sense to me as a whole. The same things are said again and again in different language, I think; I'm just finding a modern interoperation that works for me (and if others find it useful, then that's really great).

I've never really come across anything which completely integrates experiencing, patterning, intentions, body movement and larger shifts - so that was the motivation for trying to join this together. A "practical metaphysics", if you will.

> Q: I'm not sure if I can do this. Maybe fleetingly. It's hard to notice it.

The trick is to not try, because it's actually a release of your constraint on attention which brings it into experience. So, pause again, and now let go of your hold on your body, mind, *and your attention*. Then "just decide" to be the background volume of space in the room. See what happens. An alternative: you are looking at these words. Now, direct your attention to "the place your are looking out from". What do you find there? Where is its boundary?

> Q: I think this is what I already do. [Arm movement.]

Yes, not teleport. But yes, you intend the end state, and let things move by themselves, by whatever route happens to arise. The more you withdraw from intervening, the more everything takes care of itself in that respect. So imagine the same principle, but with your body, mind and attention all allowed to move freely however they want, towards the end state you have decided upon. Eventually, the feeling is one of being "open space" and experience just flowing naturally within you and as you.

> Q: Basically it boils down to willpower?

I wouldn't say willpower, but just because that's a bit of a mangled word, since for some people it implies narrowed attention and effort. It's *intending* - which is simply to bring into mind the thought of the state (or the experience) that you wish to transition to. The more you've learned to get out of the way, the more efficient the route by which that transition happens.

There's really nothing complicated about it. It's just about realising that the whole of your experience follows that same patterning, not just your arms, because it's all "inside you".

> Q: I can't let go of my attention though... but I don't know what I'm looking for.

Okay, let's check a couple of things.

First of all, this isn't something you "do", with one part of you causing it to happen to another part. It's like being a shapeshifter, with the whole of your experience moving as a whole. Secondly, you don't need to *pre-imagine* this. In other words, you don't need to already know what the experience is going to be like. So try again: simply *declare* that you are the open space of the room, and *allow* whatever happens to happen. (This is where the "mystery" aspect of things comes in more generally: you cannot know what you will experience until you experience it.)

There's another route to this, but best to do it one at a time.

Well, it's an unusual thing to do, and you can't *think* it as such, since its the context within which thinking arises. Sometimes (mostly) we need to progress through it step by step.

It's completely natural, after a trauma, to go through a phase of being on the defensive and trying to anticipate situations and prepare responses for them. But, truly, your natural, spontaneous response in a situation, if uninhibited, is the best - preprepared response won't really correspond exactly to the situation, since thought is impoverished compared to the riches of a surrounding environment. It can take us a while to build up trust in this, but eventually you will, perhaps by doing exercises like this.

[...]

No indeed, I wouldn't see it in that light either - but if someone *does* see it that way, then this (cleansing procedure) is an efficient approach. It's a case of them working with the feeling they've actually got, rather than trying to deny that feeling or persuade themselves out of it. In fact, one of the reasons the way the exercise is structured as it is, is that it hopefully guides you to unwittingly ignore all that crap, and just do the thing. The less it is contemplated, the better.

It comes down to: getting results doesn't necessarily require you to work things out. Feeling worthy or not worthy or positive or negative is just a distraction. Do you have to "raise your vibration" if you want to put the kitchen light on? No, it's just a movement and a direct interaction with the world. The pouring of the water is a direct interaction with the world.

Part Two will fill in some of the details later. One could think of that as a third situational glass, I suppose, awaiting the pure water of attention...

This subreddit and other traditions maintain that what you truly are is a "conscious space" in which experiences arise. (You can easily identify the truth of this yourself.) This is eternal, it is the fundamental truth of your reality, whereas experiences are transient, and only relatively true (vs other experiences). Suicide isn't recommended because you have potentially no control over what your *next-moment* will be. You might just get reset. You might end up "in heaven". You might be reincarnated. You might lose access to your memories so far. You-as-consciousness are guaranteed to continue; there will be more experiences arising in it. However, the nature of your experiences are not guaranteed, and "jumping" is *all about* deliberately selecting your experiences. So, the fear of death is gone (well, except for the healthy trepidation). But as a *method* of getting what you want, I think it leaves a lot to be desired.

What are the "common arguments" against suicide?

Those arguments don't really apply in this worldview I guess. If someone feels suicide is their best angle once they've got all the info, then it's for them to decide how best to proceed of course. But I'd be pretty keen for them to do their research first, because it's surely better to build on the accumulated patterns you have developed if you can. As for *Multidimensional Magick*, it is like suicide in the sense that to make a large undirected "jump" is effectively to have killed your previous world or state, and then take whatever you get. However, I'd say the shifts are still more limited, the outcome more certain, than an actual suicide. You won't get completely reset - since you are retaining a level of consciousness throughout, the fundamental patterning of *being-a-person-in-a-world* will persist; there will be a continuity of narrative.

Personally, if I found myself in such a situation - which is basically one where your current "strand of thought" has apparently become unfixable - I would seek to jump to another strand, basically create a persistent realm and then not come back. But if you can do that, you can equally use the overall approach to amend *this* one.

What circumstances do you think would count as "suicide level", taking into account the other options that are open to people who know more about this topic and related things?

> Q: What the ancients called Karma, right?

Well, I tend to think of "karma" as corresponding to those "stuck thoughts and incomplete movements" which persist due to *intentional* patterns that never got released. In other words, the actions you have taken and responses you have had, that you never allowed to fade into the background - meaning they are still "overlaid" upon your ongoing experience, contributing to it.

The *intentional* aspect of that distinguishes it from things like simply being born and being a human being, and the deterministic path that arises from the initial conditions. But it's a blurry area. In the limit, all time collapses and you are simply experiencing being an open space which responds - or rather *changes-with* - your intentions immediately. Completely releasing all patterns is the ending of experiencing - to be resumed and seeded from the first thought that arises subsequently.

> Q: Well, any circumstances . . . that not have been fixed despite of all knowledge accumulated and after . . . attempting to fix it

That seems reasonable. What happens, I guess, is that you reach the "suicide limit" - and then you discover that reality is more malleable than you thought, and that opens up further options. Then you hopefully try those out. The problem perhaps, is that you *do* have to commit to them. You have to actually intend the change, rather than just perform an act.

> Q: But perform an act isn't part of the commitment? What else can one do when the reality intended to left is totally different from the one desired?

Experiment for yourself on this, but an act alone doesn't accomplish much. If there is not a corresponding intention of what it is to produce, if no meaning has been assigned to the act, it does little. It is the intention - the activation of the desired state whilst performing the act - that makes the change. That's why you can just "imagine stuff" and then the world shifts in response. That's why you can pour some water into a glass, and suddenly your problem is solved. What we tend to call "commitment" is really the intensity of the intentional pattern summoned, rather than persistence and repetition in an act. It gets more subtle with purely imaginal acts, but whereas visualisation alone tends to generate synchronicity, imagery with an intended context works the magic.

> Q: Also, at the moment I like those theories that the life replay itself after death

Anthony Peake is very fond of the idea that we're all living in some sort of last-moment-of-death life replay, which we can explore iteratively. Of course, the actual "death" part in that is irrelevant and incorrect, because it assumes there is a "physical" life followed by an imaginary one; but we only ever experience an imaginary life.

Neville Goddard, meanwhile, is I think alluding to the fact that experiencing always continues. You are a conscious space in which experiences arise; you are associatively traversing a line of immersive thought. After *this-moment*, always a *next-moment*. If your current trajectory hits a moment where there is no plausible *next-moment* that obeys the rules - for us, a death-imminent experience - then the *next-moment* will be discontinuous. But experience will always continue in some form.

In that passage, Neville is noting that those who experience a discontinuity often might not retain access to the memories of their prior moments. The car laden with your wife and children crashes into the barrier and - *snap!* - you are lying in your college bedroom with your girlfriend. Perhaps you remember a strange dream. More than likely you just get up, and your life unfolds spontaneously from that point. Because as I'm sure you've noticed, we do not actual *think out* our actions, or refer to memories create decisions from them; those things *arise within us*.

Actually, I suspect that creating massive discontinuities via "jumping" processes does hold some risk in that area. Wishes get fulfilled, your world-pattern shifts, and you lose the pathway to memories about the previous state, or even that there *was* a previous state. A previous state is not previous in the sense of being "in the past". The so-called past or history is part of the the state, now, and gets shifted too.

Chronos and Mnemosyne - the perfect jumping partnership! :-)

In all these things, the ritual does not matter so much as the intention, and the persistence of a connection to the larger pattern (tied to your experiences-so-far), so that doesn't get lost. I suspect that once you are aware of your true situation, then your memories are attached to "the container" rather than other aspects of the content. At least, that's the way I'm approaching it.

On "dimensions and time" and so on, from the perspective of *being-a-conscious-space*, they're all just more experiences. Have you done any lucid dreaming or astral projection at all?

Drawing on the old tales for rituals and metaphor is pretty good I think, although you have to be careful in that you are invoking the extended pattern of them. For instance, you invoke Heracles for his strength, it works well, but the following week you find your music tutor dead with a lyre embedded in his skull.

Not read those Lovecrafts; thanks for the links. I've played quite a lot with lucid dreaming and had good results. Again, the key to getting them isn't about technique, it's about *firmly deciding* that you will have one. Like beginner's luck, repeatedly! I've not done anything to the extent in that post; mostly I was interested in exploring the mechanics of reality (so to speak) rather than creating adventures.

What's interesting is discerning the difference between *seeding* a location and it already being there. Really, I take the view that everything is already there (all patterns are pre-existing; it's just a matter of triggering into prominence) but the experience by its nature always gives you what you *implied* as much as what you specifically intended.

> Q: If I'm not the one who kill him, it would be just a coincidence rather than a case of invocation and possession.

But you are responsible for everything that arises in your experience, now. You killed him, and the murder weapon actually was *the coincidence!* ;-)

I think that you pretty much can't just summon an aspect. Sure, that will be the primary pattern and much more dominant, but you *always* activate the extended patterns to some extent, just by associative triggering. Probably not to the extent of medieval-themed musical murders though. Something that's just occurred to me: although I've always been a bit dismissive of "the number-based stuff", actually it is just the base level of declaring arrangements and patterns without having to create an arbitrary and irrelevant story to link the parts together.

It's an early form of extracting the *relationships* and divorcing them from the *objects* - the framework not the concepts.

There is the larger problem of reification of abstractions in technical fields also. As we were saying in an earlier comment, there can be truths which are *patterns* - patterns which are independent of particular instances with manifest objects. I think that in modern times we have lost the "vision" that allows us to discern the continuous landscapes which surround us. Which is why we are baffled when we have discontinuous experiences involving objects - we don't realise that the objects only "existed" as patterned relationships, and those relationships only exist within or *as* observations. In part, I suppose this subreddit is about what happens when you recognise this situation, and understand that relationships are of the mind, imposed upon the "infinite gloop", and not the other way around.

Browsing through some of the biog stuff, his ideas do seem to correspond nicely to the concept of eternal structures, world-patterns and the patterning of experience:

> Campbell's concept of *monomyth* (one myth) refers to the theory that sees all mythic narratives as variations of a single great story. The theory is based on the observation that a common pattern exists beneath the narrative elements of most great myths, regardless of their origin or time of creation. . .
>
> According to Campbell, the absolute mystery of life, what he called transcendent reality, cannot be captured directly in words or images. Symbols and mythic metaphors on the other hand point outside themselves and into that reality.
>
> -- *Wikipedia entry for Joseph Campbell*

[...]

Anything really, other people, anything that is part of your experience of life, but it for this demo it will all tend to happen by "plausible if unlikely" means.

Drinking is fine, I might even include that in the instructions, just to clear up the ambiguity of what to do with the water afterwards.

Yep, just carry on with daily life. The change had already been made ; you'll encounter evidence as time goes by, so just wait and see. I suggest that it's better to let this change unfold and settle before doing another one. More than anything, this exercise is meant to demonstrate to you that there's "something going on" here. If you change too many things at once, at the very least the cause-effect connection is not going to be as clear.

So, it's an example of bringing and end-state to mind and allowing yourself to spontaneously shift to that state without interference. Usually when people stand up - we're talking about doing it self-consciously here - they begin by *re-asserting* the seated position, and then they *move their bodies* to the upright position. (In fact, I think a lot of people constantly re-assert their current state, which is a problem for this whole thing.)

But there is no need for this "manual" approach, and in general there is no need to know or manage the "how" of a change. Instead, one simply *summons the pattern to mind* (the pattern of "being stood up") and it is incorporated into your current state ("being a body" + "being stood up"). From that point onwards your ongoing experience falls into line with the new state, leading to:"experiencing *being-stood-up* a moment from now, via the path of *standing-up*".

For OCD stuff, do you do a daily exercise or anything? It doesn't need to be a meditation (in fact, I think if you're going through an OCD phase you can end up focusing *more* on things via meditation), just a "daily releasing".

Daily Releasing Exercise - Literally, lie on the floor for 10 minutes every day in the constructive rest position (feet flat, knees up, couple of books supporting the head) and... give up and "play dead". For those minutes, let your mind and body and (most importantly) your attentional focus just move and change how they want. Think of it as letting your nervous system cool off, like how car engine "unwinds" after a journey as it relaxes and settles. Typically, during this exercise, your attention will occasionally narrow on something (an ache, a thought) and it will intensify, peak, and then dissolve. You just let this happen by itself. If you notice your attentional focus is 'fixed' on something, just release a hold of it again. When the 10 minutes are up, instead of jumping up by tensing your muscle, try just "asking" for your body to stand up in the best way possible, and see if you can just "allow" it to move under its own steam.



Note - There is no "right thing" that should happen during this exercise. As well as a relaxation, it is a "what happens if I just let things unfold without interference?" exercise.

And bear in mind that this particular exercise is deliberately broad in that it doesn't require a worldview or being detailed. It's particularly good for specific personal situations, but it *will* generate results of *some* sort for anything. Typically they will arise in terms of "plausible but very unlikely" occurrences.

What you're doing with any approach is activating a particular pattern that is overlaid over all experience - which then appears to "shine through" whenever an appropriate context arises. The more specific you are, the narrower the context. However, you'll always see aspects of the extended pattern you've triggered arising.

See The Owls for an example of this. This highlights how the process is "dumb" and automatic.

It *does* mean it will manifest; but manifestation works by pattern activation.

That's why you tend to see related synchronicity before and after. There's actually no fundamental difference between, say, a picture of an owl on a wall, and a "real" owl in my room - they are both images, sounds, texture floating in conscious experience; they are just different "shapes".

So wait and see! However, if you later feel you have been doing this demo exercise for something pretty implausible, and that the pattern hasn't persisted because it didn't shine through in context, you can be more direct about it. But give it some time. (Remember that this is a zero-commitment, zero-belief demonstration exercise really. Although the results can be dramatic all the same.)

It's all pretty super-simple really; it's describing it that's complicated (because there really isn't a way, it's just about choosing the most flexible view that "lets you let things"). The hardness of a table's surface is simple and obvious.

Meanwhile, the *theory* or description of "hardness" is very complicated - and still never communicates the reality of it, and actually obscures it for the duration of your thinking. So FTW... *"cease, and stop generating"*. However, consciously chosen metaphors/patterns do provide routes for change.

> Q: Is there any danger in doing this for the same result twice? I forgot to really concentrate on my life being filled with the first situation, and I'm not sure if this messed it up or not. I followed the rest perfectly though.

Give it a while and then, if you feel the need, do it again. Note that it doesn't "accumulated" though - doing it lots of times has no benefit - because each time you do it is a resetting. A bit like how going from sitting to standing repeatedly doesn't make you "more standing", it just gives you a chance to leave yourself standing on two feet if you accidentally stood on one foot earlier.

The summarising word needs to come from yourself, and from the situation or pattern. There is no specific "good word" to choose independently of that, no magic phrases.

What you do is, you contemplate the situation, pause and feel it for a while, and then see what word best captures that. Basically, you let the word *come to you*, and find one which "feels right". That word is then a "sensory handle" on the situation; it's actually a part of that situation, which came from it - a sensory aspect of a larger extended submerged pattern, like the tip of an iceberg poking up from the ocean.

Theoretically anything is possible, but in this particular exercise you would expect "plausible even if very unlikely events" as the route - your base patterning isn't being affected. You are choosing the flow of the water by moving a few stones here, rather than reforming the whole landscape. (Or: you are making some new doorways in the walls of your house, you are not rebuilding its foundations.)

Labels should be one word because this is *not* a "send a request to the universe" type deal. The words are "handles" onto the patterns of the before and after states. Therefore, you should arrive at the words by pondering each situation, and seeing what words come up from that, what seems to fit, rather than working it out intellectually or writing a description. (You may get results from that, but it will be based on the limited pattern that you wrote down, rather than the complex state you were actually referring to.)

Yeah, the instructionf to use a single word isn't super-important in and of itself - what it's trying to do is force you to ponder and find the best way of encapsulating the situations *from the states themselves*, rather than just writing stuff out. Since the word is a "handle" onto a larger pattern, you don't *need* more than one word, and it reduces the triggering of other associations.

As for the rest, well the idea of the exercise is really to have fun and explore something about the nature of our ongoing experience. Specific results are, really, a pleasant side-effect. A playful attitude (kid-friendly glue!) is exactly the right sort of approach for this stuff. :-)

"Unpaid and paid" would only be a problem if you *just* wrote down the words with no contemplation at all - because then you would be triggering all extended patterns associated with those terms, with just a bit of context. Having the words arise from your idea of the situations, though - or contemplating the meaning of the words you've chosen - links them to the specific states.

It's like how a word has different meaning in different contexts. For example, "force" written on the front of a physics textbook has a different meaning to "force" written on the front of a *Star Wars* book. Meanwhile,

"force" written on a random piece of paper you discovered on the street might mean anything at all - in effect the full extended pattern of "force", combined with your own general formatting. If you just write the word, you're doing the last of these. If you contemplate a bit or let the word arise, it's like choosing between the first two - the word has a contextual meaning *and* is a handle on the "full text of the book", as it were.

But now that you see the background reasoning, you should feel free to play with it of course, tweak it to fit your own style if you like.

[...]

> Q: Do the words have to be short? Or can you write long written sentences?

If you read through the comments, you'll find that it's suggested you do single words, because this is *not* about "sending a message to the universe". This is about creating a "handle" onto a pattern.

So, you contemplate each situation, and see what word "comes up" - what best seems to encapsulate the situation. Then that's the word you use. The information doesn't need to be on the label, because the information is in you/the world - you are just making a link. Also, not all information is sensory; the entirety of the meaning associated with a situation is more than you can visualise/hear/feel. If you just write a sentence not the label, instead of getting a grip on the actual state, then you're just triggering the extended pattern of the words, independently of the actual situation you're dealing with. (There may be overlap in what gets triggered, but one is specific and one is general in nature.)

If you've done the exercise, *then it is done.* Follow the last instruction! There is nothing for you to do except get on with your life. Just let it go. The outcome has already happened, literally, and the experiences will now "happen to you" as if laid out as a sequence of pre-determined moments, all without you having to consciously manage them or second-guess yourself.

Just as with life more generally, there's not much point in being analytical about this. Doing so assumes you can *work out* the state of things by creating a little parallel construction in thought, when actually thoughts themselves are aspects of that state. It would be like trying to create a sandcastle which accurately represented both "sand" *and* "the beach"! You can solve conceptual problems (stuff you *think about*), but you can't solve experiential states (your ongoing *life*) - you can only intend new target states and allow the world to *auto-complete* the path between here and there. Plot twist: solving conceptual problems actually works the same way and the experience of "solving" is just a bit of theatre.

Yeah, so that was my spontaneous little spiel to encourage you to give up thinking analytically about life, regardless of this little exercise. Good luck! :-)

[...]

What happened was: I just often found myself questioning reality and my own thought process! :-)

> Q: it's just coincidence that I wake up with a remembered state and all changes already allowed for every day

Clarify?

> Q: well, that i wake up and events that are **already known** occur to me is "coincidental" to me experiencing them (because i decided the day before or the week before or even a few years before to

experience the experience) - but in reality, their cause is **incidental** to my experiencing them (i decided to let it happen)

666
alertajudiada.com
SHOWN IN "DER STÜRMER", Sep 1939
UNDER THE SPELL OF THE JEW
Im Banne des Juden
The world is in bondage to the Jew,
they are subordinate to his will
and he forces them in the night of
the insanity with the power of secret forces.

take, for example, a worldwide religious sect that is based on opposing nature and instead sees itself as the ultimate source of **everyone's** reality (including my own) - well why won't they just stop annoying me? why is it that everything i do to oppose this sect only emboldens them? because i want it that way...at least, i hope.

Oh, I see. Well, maybe we have to be careful about "want it that way" though, because I think we trigger all sorts of things accidentally, *by implication*. If we intend something that *implies* another thing, then we are both creating (increasing the contribution of) the fact of the intention, and of the facts implied by the intention.

For example, in your example, you may be performing actions which imply the ongoing existence of the sect. For as long as you were fighting such a sect, you would be implying something existing for you to fight. Etc.

[...]

It's a common question, but there is no other "you" necessarily. It's more like the dream your are having about *being-a-person-in-a-world* shifts dramatically. Check out the sidebar links or the other recommended links for details.

> Q: How does this theoretically work? Is there a reasoning behind it? This smacks of [mirror gazing], and a totally different result.

Good question. The nature of this is that there is no "theory" as such because it is "before" observation, only metaphors. This method is basically mirror gazing as a way to detachment and releasing intention (old magick style). The larger concept (see links in sidebar) is about re-patterning of experience, or the intentional creation of /r/Glitch_in_the_Matrix. Overall, I'd say the perspective is that of (philosophical) idealism and nonduality - updating your "private view" in the network within a mental universe.

How long have you been in the dimension you are in now? ;-)

"Jumping" is really a metaphor for changing your experience dramatically, such that it's as if you've switched to a different world ("dimension"). If you can do this once, you can do it again!

The experience is exactly that, though. You wake up and, over the following days, you find that the *facts* of the world have shifted. Friends behave differently, some historical facts have changed, some buildings might be there that weren't there before, new opportunities appear that seem very unlikely.

A good way to think of it is that everyone has their own "private view" of the universe, and can choose different experiences. You are always in your "own dimension" and you can change which facts you let in. "Dimension jumping" is when you let go in a way that allows the facts to shift.

So you never "swap bodies" with "another you" or whatever - you are just changing the experience you are having to one that is the best version, something that would be your best dimension (hopefully).

> Q: So, it's a mental trick. Nothing more.

Only in the sense that your current perception is a "mental trick"

If you can imagine it then, yes, it obviously exists *as a thought*. And what is the difference between being in a place and thinking about it? Perhaps not much.

Okay, so you really have to shift your idea a little bit of what the world is and what "you" are. The short version:

- What you truly are is a conscious space which "takes on the shape of" experiences.
- Currently you are taking on the shape of a *being-a-person-in-a-world* experience. Or more accurately, being a world from the perspective of a person.
- The world is *not* a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time".

- The world *is* more like a "shared resource" of all possible experiential patterns, at different levels of contribution.
- In effect you have a "private view" of the world, a personal slice of the "infinite gloop". And so does "everyone else".

That maybe gives you an insight into the answers to those questions?

It's worth browsing the key posts above, but if you read maybe *The Imagination Room*, then *The Hall of Records* or *The Infinite Grid*, then *All Thoughts Are Facts* that probably gives you the basics in terms of metaphors.

A partial version would be like having hypnagogic imagery and entering a new dream; in a complete version you'd have no memory of your previous states so it would be like being born again? Perhaps this is what happened when you started this life.

I wouldn't do it just for a laugh - you should have a *specific intention* in mind and have thought it through - but it's not like you are going to wake up and people have disappeared.

A so-called "jump" is a change of state of the world, and that includes (or *is*) your own state. So I think it can be beneficial. Being in a bad state is more likely to affect your choices than anything else, rather than affecting the actual process. People have done it for all sorts of thing involving their personality, and since personality = apparent behaviour = apparent perception, this seems as good a target as anything.

Doing something like the *Two Glasses Exercise* for stability is a good approach I think; it can only assist. Separately, if working towards being able to stabilise and direct your perception, I recommend experimenting with treating your ongoing experience as an "imagination space".

Really this is about deliberate, *intentional* imagination and shifts. For instance, passing thoughts don't matter - they are just bubbles from your current state. It's *deliberate* thinking and movement and action that matters. Now, in the past you might have "accidentally deliberately" worked against yourself sometimes (in effect, fantasising about poor outcomes that concern you), but you won't be doing that anymore, will you?

But if you *do* end up in an unpleasant state, you'll now be armed with the approach to change it again. You'll always want to do occasional course correction anyway; that's just how it is. You can't fully anticipate everything that might arise in your life. Which is why it's worth living it in the first place!

[...]

Hey. Well, "magic(k)" is just a name given to the deliberate changing of your experience without seeming to do so directly by contact in space and time. And "dimensional jumping" is a way of doing the same thing: shifting your experience to something resembling a new set of facts.

So one way to look at it: you had the experience of "someone doing black magic" and your subsequent *facts-of-the-world* shifted accordingly. But the world you are living in is *your* copy of the world; nothing happens without your allowing it (although you might allow things through ignorance); you can make changes directly if your decide to do so.

The magic**k**-with-a-**k** spelling was adopted by some groups to distinguish performance magic (Penn & Teller, David Blaine, Dynamo) from reality-manipulation (Aleister Crowley, The Golden Dawn, Chaos Magick), although it's not always used.

The best thing you will ever learn is that there is no "how it really is", no secret knowledge, and no mission you are on - except that which you adopt and pursue for yourself. If you go into the world looking for answers, what you'll get is a reflection of your own uncertainty, your own insecurities, or fragments of the theories you are holding at that moment. Nobody has ultimate power over you, none that you can't just take back.

So just treat right-now as fresh and think: how do you want the world to be, what kind of life do you want to be living? Then you can do some patterning stuff, and commit to that new state.

Who knows what might have happened, in terms of that perfection; that's always a bit of a imagination game. *But* you can *definitely* resurrect things, even though you've not played with this much before.

I'd suggest... What's *easiest* is, focusing on what you want to happen right now, from here. The no-effort version is via the "plausible if very unlikely" path.

It's true that you can't predict exactly how things will unfold until you experience it; it is literally a mystery. It's like laying one pattern on top of another: you can't tell what the result will be until you actually do it. (Hypothetically you could calculate it, but the world is too complex, and getting the data and performing the calculation *would itself be an observation*.)

However, it's not like a genie or a cantankerous god is doing this for you; there is no contract other than the design of the target. It's a "dumb" patterning system which generally results in the most efficient route that can be slid between your factual observations to date. I'd say: the back of your mind, simply have that your intention is for it to happen in the best way possible, or similar. If you *do* get restrictive, all you're doing is narrowing the possible things that can happen.

Remember, all change involves discomfort of some sort. You can have a different circumstance arise without this one being 'destroyed'. Maybe, occasionally, a bit of 'trial' is how things will happen - but that's were having 'faith' comes in: you know that this is a shift towards your desired state, so you ride with it.

In terms of the labels, the are just meant to encapsulate the current and target situations. In other words, you're not meant to be writing out a description as if you were sending out a request - rather, you have in mind the situation, and see what word (the "handle") arises from that. It's okay to use more than one word, definitely; but remember it's just meant to be the essence of the situation/intention so that you have appropriate labels for the glasses. This is no "asking the universe" type deal. It's a direct interaction with, and shifting of, the world-pattern. So don't worry about the details, just specify your target state and the idea that you want the best of the world also.

[...]

> > Q: So basically I just have to try really hard to fall prey to confirmation bias and wishful thinking and then I'll have jumped? Maybe ad hoc a couple of things too? God forbit if I post hoc in any way, though.

Well, nobody's making you post-, ad-, or any other hoc, right? It's pretty easy to avoid confirmation bias if you're a skeptic (in the proper sense of the term). Maybe you mean the frequency illusion? You can take steps

there too. Results are coincidences? Conduct further experiments to establish a causal connection (or indeed to disprove one).

As the sidebar says: Never believe something without personal evidence; never dismiss something without personal evidence.

Or you can just not bother, of course. Having no view on the matter is a third and perfectly reasonable position to take. (In fact, that should be your default view on pretty much everything, I'd say. Ideas you have no direct experience of are basically just stories. They might be *useful* stories; but there's no need to *believe in* them.)

Okay, let's maybe rewind a bit and work through this step by step?

What Are We Trying To Prove?

We'll perhaps begin with:

- What, *exactly*, would we be trying to prove to ourselves here, by experimenting with one of these methods?

I would suggest: what we would be trying to prove is not that there is something called "dimensional jumping" - because that is just a metaphor, a conceptual framework. Rather, we are trying to demonstrate to ourselves that we can, through some act or practice, bring about personal experiences which correspond to our intention or desire.

Meanwhile, "personal experience" is evidence that... you had a particular experience. *Anything* beyond that is storytelling. Even if you replicate the experience, and even if you get others to replicate it, all that you prove is that there is an "observable regularity" to your experience. Any conceptual framework you erect around is a connective fiction; it is not "what is really happening".

So to emphasise: "jumping" and the associated metaphors would be simply a way of *thinking* about this, a convenient narrative which provides a conceptual framework for those observations. But the observations would come first. The observations are all that is "true".

Returning to confirmation bias, let's go with the streamlined definition: *"Confirmation bias (or confirmatory bias) is a tendency to search for or interpret information in a way that confirms one's preconceptions, leading to statistical errors."*

So-called "jumping" asserts that there is, in fact, *no* underlying interpretation to any observed changes brought about by its approach. There is no "how it works" in particular. There are ways of *conceiving of change*, but those are not descriptions of how change occurs.

What we are left with is:

- Is the *fact* of observing a change, a sign that one's prior act was causal in some way?

No. One case of this would be a (literal) coincidence. Many cases might be a correlation. But at no stage would you have to commit to the notion that it was "true" that performing an exercise "caused" a result. And you would certainly not confuse any of the metaphors for a "causal mechanism" that was happening behind the scenes.

What Could We Confirm?

So what you end up with is only ever, *at best:*

1. A correlation between the content of two experiences, in this case:
    - An experience of "my body and thoughts performing an intentional act".
    - A subsequent experience of "being in a situation whose content corresponds to the intention".
2. A selection of conceptual frameworks which assist us when thinking about those correlations.

If you never witness a correlation, then you never witnessed a correlation. How you interpret that, is up to you - just as if you get a "positive" result. You might say, "Maybe I didn't believe in it enough!" Okay, that's one theory. Maybe you could try again and believe in it more. Not sure how you do that though. Or you might say, "Maybe it just doesn't work." Well, it definitely didn't work that time, that's for sure.

In short, if people "want to believe" then they alway go looking for signs and confirmation. That's true in science, psychology, everyday life, and this. It is independent of the particular topic. It's up to *you* how you approach things. And my personal approach: why believe anything? Abstract concepts and beliefs are *always wrong* in the sense of *not being how it is*.

The benchmark instead should be:

- Is it useful for your purpose?

TL;DR Summary

Trying to bring this together in to some sort of overview:

- Aiming to prove that concepts are *true* is the wrong approach. They never are; they are merely *useful* or *not-useful* when pursuing a particular outcome.
- "Understanding" is not a useful outcome unless it is applied in the service of producing other outcomes; because all "understandings" are merely "connective fictions" or metaphors.
- "Jumping" is metaphor which can be used for thinking about observed correlations between certain personal acts and subsequent personal experiences. It is not "true" apart from this - and that is fine.

I suppose it's best to clear something up: nothing is being marketed in terms of a way of thinking - there's not even the promotion of a particular worldview as *fact*, only as conceptual framework. If there's anything being consistently adhered to, it's more of a meta-position akin to philosophical idealism: begin from direct experience, proceed from there.

Okay, let's continue (interesting discussion), and I'd begin by saying that this is a problematic phrase:

> Q: Truth is the reality of facts, independent from whomever is observing.

It's laden with presuppositions, but that's not necessarily important. Science doesn't get at any of those things, nor is it intended to. That is philosophy. Science is an approach whereby the subset of observed regularities in personal experience which can be intersubjectively agreed upon in language, are abstracted as conceptual frameworks. (Although there is some interplay between observation, language and concepts here, as any anthropologist would tell you.)

More leanly:

- Science *in effect* is the study of a subset of subjective personal experience that can be easily communicated intersubjectively.

Are we suggesting that everything which falls outside of this remit would be a "mental trick"?

It's unlikely anyone would say "it's just a mind experience" I suppose, because that would be redundant. *All* experience is a "mind experience". Although what you're actually trying to say is that, if someone reports experiencing an apparent change in their environment of that nature, they should be told it is "not real"? The problem with this is, to do that we'd have to be able to say how, *exactly*, it came about. I don't think there's a way to do that.

I'm not sure what you mean by "reality is... real"? Do you mean that there is an independent, persistent, consistent substrate which underpins all experience? That isn't at all clear. Science certainly lets us identify those aspects of experience which seem to be persistent and consistent, but it can't really address the nature of this, nor claim that this is all there is.

That science is a systematic (ideally anyway) approach to gathering evidence that suggests, supports, and perhaps later contradicts conceptual frameworks - of course. But that evidence is *always* experienced subjectively. What science does (quite rightly) is in effect throw away all the aspects of subjective experience which cannot be confirmed intersubjectively = the objective frame.

However, that doesn't say anything about "reality" at all. It is instead something like:

- The best account of the those elements of subjective experience which can be: a) correlated intersubjectively, and; b) described in terms of available language.

Which is great. And you could *define* that subset of experience as "the real", however you'd then need another term for "how things actually are" because this is only a subset of that.

Aside: Don't think that I am science bashing here. I'm a big fan and did physics before escaping for the cash. But I think it's important to pay attention to what we are *actually* doing in science, rather than the *story about* what we are doing.

On the multiverse hypothesis in quantum mechanics: as science, despite the enthusiastic articles in popular science magazines, it's rubbish. Quantum mechanics is a mathematical formulation which predicts the set of potential outcomes from a particular, well-defined situation. Any step we take beyond that, is philosophy or metaphysics, and there's no way to distinguish between the options.

Which is completely fine. So long as we bear in mind that this is what we're dealing with. A quantum mechanics experiment produces an outcome; the multiverse theory is a way of thinking about it. "Multiverses" can never be distinguished from other interpretations, so they are not scientific. You might *infer* that the results of your experiment are *consistent* with the concept of a multiverse, for sure, but you cannot establish them as the best description. You can merely find that description a *useful way* of conceptualising the *fact* of the observed result.

[*Aside* - It is interesting to note that some recent interpretations of QM, such as QBism, are switching to a subjective frame and essentially deferring worrying about the objective frame since it is basically inaccessible (effectively non-existant, others might say).]

In the same sense "dimensional jumping" is not literally jumping dimensions, because the very idea of a dimension is unfalsifiable. Which is why it doesn't claim to be that (the term is actually an unfortunate leftover; it's not something I would have chosen). In fact, you'll note that the whole subreddit is very much geared towards: do not believe in any explanation. Do an experiment and see what happens. Any descriptions are at the philosophical and metaphysical level.

[*Aside* - Slightly retreading here, but: I would say science cannot *even* approximate the nature of reality, but what it can do is get better and better at creating self-consistent descriptions for the subset of observations that fall within its domain. By "nature" of reality I mean, what is the *nature of experiencing itself*. Because all of our evidence is made from that.]

So this probably leads us to something like, that the perspective of this subreddit is something like this:

1. It is suggested that by performing certain exercises one can have subjective experiences which correspond to one's intention. Only you can satisfy yourself of this; it is not a matter of belief.
2. No claims are made as to the underlying nature of these experiences, because it is inherently inaccessible to study. (Although see 4.)
3. However, certain philosophical or metaphysical frameworks can be useful in conceptualising the nature of experience and the apparent results.
4. Finally, there *are* approaches to better comprehending the subjective experience from within the subjective frame. However, they are not useful for objective frame modelling because they are "before" that.

The word "subjective" is not intended in a dismissive sense; it is a recognition that such experiences are by their nature "before" objective concepts.

So a couple of questions which might spur us on in interesting directions:

- Do you believe in an objective reality? If so, why and in what sense, exactly?
- How would we test for "mind self-deception" in quite practical terms?

Note that I don't use the word "connection fiction" in a derogatory way. I mean, literally, that they are invented concepts which connect observations and provide a coherent framework for thinking, designing experiments, and making predictions.

[...]

> > Q: I have a question about the "Just Decide" exercise. How long should we be "deciding" to get up? I realize it might not work right away or for the first couple times. As much as I want to eventually jump dimensions, I want to still be doing other things (at least, building good habits when the time comes to jump). I can imagine it eating up a huge chunk of time if it doesn't work right away.

Well, how I'd approach: every day, just for general life improvement, you should be doing a ten minute session of lying on the floor and "playing dead and giving up". At the end of that, you should... continue to do nothing. No more than an ten additional minutes.

The key to all of this is to *cease holding onto your attentional focus*. Most people have the habit of narrowing their focus when they intend things - e.g doing computer stuff or whatever, or even walking to the door. You don't need to do that. And it actually *locks you in state* and opposes any shift! Leave your *attention* open to roam as it likes, and let the movement follow your *intention*.

So when you are "playing dead", you let your body, mind *and attention* move freely. And then when it's time to get up, the intention leads to the movement with no manipulation of attention (it'll feel like it "just happens", because you won't experience any "doing"). But note: this is not *required* for making changes, it just makes things effortless because you've ceased to oppose shifts in your world; it makes just moving around doing everyday stuff as a body feel pretty nice. Another thing you can try is to imagine you are the background space in the room, rather than a body inside it. This releases "holding" quite efficiently.

Yeah, it's not easy to describe "intending". It has been described elsewhere as:

- "To wish without wishing, to do without doing, there is no technique to intending, one simply intends."

Which is perhaps not very helpful.

My best description would be, that to intend is to "change your shape" such that something is true. So if the world was a landscape, and you were that world, then to intend it to be different would be to simply shift yourself so that you *take on the shape* of the new situation, the new contours. In this case, you are *changing the landscape* such that your body will be getting up.

What the exercise is meant to demonstrate to you is that any "action" you perform, that you feel yourself doing, in order to cause change, is superfluous. It's all just theatre you engage in to experience yourself "causing". In this exercise you don't cause anything, you simply intend it to be so - *assert* the fact of it - and it will happen subsequently.

So you lie down and, having simply intended that you will get up, your work is done and it is already true. You remain non-attached ("you are okay with whatever happens") and "getting up" will come into experience by itself.

If that's not working for you, then try this description:

- Centre your attention near your forehead, a couple of inches back, thereby withdrawing your "presence" from the rest of your body. *Then:*
- "Wish" to stand up but don't do anything about it, instead remain centred in the forehead, and allow whatever arises to unfold without interference.

This is a zone empty of sensory experience so you don't trigger your nervous system habits. What's probably happening is that you are re-triggering the "my body is in position" pattern. (If you do the letting-go exercise for long enough, this will fade in its own time, which is when successful "spontaneous" movement kicks in.)

I get that because this is experiential it's not easy to read and then replicate, without someone able to guide you in person.

[...]

Well, things are gonna change anyway, right? Even if you got skinnier by going on a massive diet, or got taller by (um) going on a rack, those actions would have repercussions - even if that's because you'd have to go shopping to get different sized clothes, and so would take a trip you wouldn't have, meaning you met other people, maybe you taste in clothes shifted a bit into a new style...

So it's just the same except the changes happen faster, and sometimes it's hard to work out the link between one and the other because it's not logically connected.

Anyway, if you just want to "look and see", then pick a situation that is a problem right now, maybe like a interpersonal problem, that is unlikely to solve itself - and do the *The Glasses Exercise*. Or you could try deliberately creating synchronicity by spending 5-10 minutes imagining that an owl is sat there in front of you, just sitting and looking at the imaginary owl, with the idea that you want "owls to fill your life from now on". Both are "a bit of fun" but will likely teach you something about how you feel about this stuff really.

Another way to think of this is: if the world does turn out to work a bit differently to how you thought, if it *is* a bit like an imagination room, if the scene around you right now is more like a very vivid thought floating in mind, it would be worth finding out yeah? Y'know, just for the fun of it!

[...]

> > Q: You know why it's better at night? Because the body enters lucid state much easier. Of course you are not traveling anywhere. The kind of thing described here violates the second rule of thermodynamics. If you claim that you can violate rules of thermodynamics with a mirror you should be a leader of the earth by now. Of course it's impossible if you clam this show some proof. Of course you have no proof. I love how little kids claim to violate fundamental laws of physics yet show 0 proof of any sort.

That rather misses the point, no? Certainly you are not traveling anywhere physically. Although you might want to define: what *is* a law of thermodynamics, exactly? Shortly after that, I'd like you to prove to me that you are a conscious being who experiences thoughts and sensations. ;-)

What do I have to prove exactly, and to whom, and why?

You're going to have to wade into some metaphysics so we can be clear about where you're coming from:

- How do you determine that something is "physical" rather than, say, "mental"?
- What is a "thought", exactly, and how is it detected?
- What is a "law of physics", how are they arrived at, and how does it influence reality?

In answer to *your* question, "mind" is a poorly-defined word whose meaning varies depending on context, but I will define it as:

- "A term used to indicate a 'container' concept in which it is envisaged that personal thoughts, sensations and perceptions arise as a conscious experience"

> Q: You don't have to prove anything but if you are making an extraordinary claim without any evidence and we all know extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence then don't be surprised nobody takes you seriously.

I'd say you've got it the wrong way around. Nobody can give you evidence of anything ("extraordinary" or not). All they can do is point you towards an experience that will indicate to you that the world is a certain way (or not). They can say "I did this, this happened; you try it too, see if it happens for you".

This is true of all physics too, but because we have become accustomed to certain experiences, or thinking in certain ways, or accepting second-hand evidence, we tend to forget an important fact:

Experiences are all that is true, everything else is imagined. All claims are actually pointers indicating a potential experience - or they are not claims at all.

From elsewhere: My own guidelines are: experiences are *real experiences*; explanations are *useful narratives*. We must be careful not to treat the concepts we invent as actual things, even when they seem to work really well. Our observations are what define our stories, our stories don't define what it is possible to observe. That's why we should welcome different ideas, because fragments of them might be useful later on.

(Strongly recommend the linked article from N. David Mermin, by the way. A related *Nature* article about QBism is also worth everyone's time.)

I wasn't being facetious when I asked about whether you could prove you were conscious. Some well-known scientists have (in effect) claimed that awareness is an "illusion" because it cannot be observed non-subjectively. It is important to contemplate these things. Do you require other people to have a model fully describing consciousness, thoughts, dreams, perception before you will believe they exist? Because that is like saying you will not believe your own observations until there is an explanation for them. Which is science inverted and rendered meaningless! This gets to the heart of what is being explored here.

[...]

Sounds to me like you're just nervous and tensed up in company, makes you awkward and reactive, and maybe your efforts to control it don't always work out. That will improve in time anyway, but you might find a couple of things useful.

First, you should do some sort of daily letting go exercise, just to let your nervous system settle out. With these exercises, there's nothing to achieve or an experience to attain, you're just allowing things you've accumulated ("stuck thoughts and incomplete movements") to unwind themselves. Here's mine:

- **Daily Releasing Exercise**

Every day, for 10 minutes, lie down on the floor in the constructive rest position: feet flat, knees up, hands resting on abdomen, a couple of books under the head so that it feels supported. Lie down in this position and give up, play dead. Give yourself to gravity, the universe, whatever. Let go of your body, your mind and - particularly - let go of controlling your attention.



Allow your body and mind and attentional focus to shift and move however they want. And if you happen to notice yourself "holding on" again, gripping anything, just let go once more.

Now, sometimes you might find that your attention narrows on a particular sensation, which then intensifies, peaks, then releases, after which your attention opens out again. That is fine. Just let that happen. Let anything happen, for those 10 minutes.

Second, there's an easy thing you can do to help yourself stay calmer throughout the day:

- **Living From Your Centre**

As you go about your day and particularly in stressful social situations, try resting your attention in your lower abdomen - the area in centre of your body, couple of inches under your naval. This helps keep you calm and grounded, and sort of openly aware but detached. Experiment with "moving from the centre" and you'll find everything much easier. For example, when you are walking, rather than moving your legs and arms directly, just imagine you are moving that central area, and let your body follow along by itself. Similarly, when in conversation, "sit with" that area, and let your responses come from there. (This will make more sense if you try it.) You'll find you "get" what's happening in a situation more easily if you do, and that your responses are more appropriate as a result.

[...]

Welcome to your new world! Well, it's the same as it always was, it's just that you've just realised something about how it's been working all along.

The Imagination of Neville Goddard

One of the most eloquent promoters of the New Thought view that imagination affects experience was Neville Goddard. Although not strictly 'dimensional jumping', his ideas are one way that we can envisage "what fills the gap" - how new experiences are seeded in the gaps between moments.

Candles and mirrors and detached states are all very well, but the resultant shifts are a plunge into the unknown if you aren't clear about what dictates their direction.

This may sound familiar:

> Self-abandonment! That is the secret. You must abandon yourself mentally to your wish fulfilled in your love for that state, and in doing, live in the new state and no more in the old state. You can't commit yourself to what you do not love, so the secret of self-commission is faith - plus love.
>
> Faith is believing what is unbelievable. Commit yourself to the feeling of the wish fulfilled, in faith that this act of self-commission will become a reality. And it must become a reality because imagining *creates* reality.
>
> -- *The Law and the Promise*, Neville Goddard

The world is imagination! Notice the mention of "feeling" as being fundamental to his technique (described elsewhere in the book). This is also emphasised in his *The Power of Awareness*, which is probably the better book. Both are interesting reading though, if you can put aside some dated wording and the biblical references. Goddard viewed the Bible as a metaphorical guide to the true nature of reality, with 'God' and 'Jesus' and 'the son and the father' representing the process of creation and the relationship between imagination and the world as experienced.

Reality-shifting Retrospective

The post below is excerpted from page 15 of the stories section over at Realityshifters.com. I came across it again recently and figured others might find it interesting. It's not strictly dimensional jumping, but it covers the imagination -> reality thing very well from one person's view.

It was one of the first "hmm" stories I came across, after reading an old book on visualization which had also covered the "car parking space" thing mentioned, and it triggered the whole idea of an "ongoing updatable now". Enjoy.

Three Shifts

Nugo, El Dorado Hills, California

These are three shifts that took place just days apart.

- We live next door to a park and we were going to go play base ball with the kids and dog. My husband goes to the bucket to look for the MIT, bat and ball, and ... No bat, my son looked-No bat. I looked-No bat. I walked away and thought to my self "reality shift" and said aloud to myself I can shift this, the bat is there. I told my son to look again. There was the bat under a toy that we had all looked under.
- I was wiping off the counter in the kitchen and there was a bottle of soda on the counter with no lid on it. Looked around for the lid and figured it will show up. Well, it did! Right on top of the soda. My son who was standing next to me said, "That wasn't there before." It was fun to have someone else witness it too.
- Change of season for the clothing and I was looking for this sleeveless top in the closet. Went through each hanger 3 times, dug through all the drawers no shirt. I knew this shirt was there and I really wanted to wear it. I just stopped and laughed pushed back a hanger that I had pushed many times and ah ha! It was there!

About Shifting

I could go on and on about shifts in my life and I subtly knew about them but kind of dismissed them as oh well. All I have to do is Ask, "Parking space in the front please" and wait usually no more than 30 seconds and one always appears. I have been doing this for years unconsciously but now it is a conscious thing. You call it reality shifting but I call it manifesting. Everything we need is there for our asking. Once we understand that this is truly an illusion and it is ours to manipulate and direct through our thoughts many shifts can take place.

This is why the power of imagination is so important and my big soap box is that our children are lacking time to create - i.e. taking all art out of the ciriculum. We are creators and it is through the mind-our creativity that we can manifest our reality. If I was of the conspiracy theory mindset one would think creativity has been slowly squeezed out of our lives because it prevents us from manifesting our given right to all information, all things and allows for others who understand this consciously and unconsciously to control.

If we can think of it, it exists! If we can think of it, it exists. Once we realize this potential - or not even potential, this *truth* - that we have total control over our destiny, then, and only then can we make choices/shifts in how we live. Yikes! Frankly, that is a lot to ask for of most people. People like the idea that someone, something else controls their destiny.

How I Manifest/Shift

It is created with a thought. A very focused clean and clear thought. Then a visual image is formed in the mind clean and clear, then the request is made to the great cosmic goo where all matter is derived, it is brought down through the various frequencies, transformed through the power of the spoken word, and then the knowing, knowing that it is true. A key point is to know that it is *true-already*. Gratitude is always good, then just look to find it. Give thanks when it does appear. Your mother taught you that please and thank you are always good - it applies here too.

Very simple yes, but the knowing part is for some reason is the hardest part to accept. Ninety-nine percent of the time I can request a parking space and get it at once. Ego says, "That was just luck." Reality says, "Just ask and you shall receive, it is all there waiting for you." There is no difference between a bottle cap, parking space, or baseball bat, or 10 million dollars. It all comes down to whether or not we know that this is what we truly want, and if we are ready to receive it into our lives. A bottle cap has a lot less impact upon our lives than millions of dollars -- but they are all the same energetically. They all originate in a thought and isn't that what everything is?

[...]

> Q: very interesting, thanks for sharing
>
> I tried this yesterday with a few things, but I have trouble at the point when it comes to "knowing that it's true already". I wanted to do the thought experiment, where you just turn off all your sensoric experience to get aware of what you really are, I simply cant get to the point where I dont feel my limbs anymore or dont hear anything.

On the thought experiment, you are just imagining what it would be like; that's enough to give you the understanding.

On knowing it's true - try and view your experience as being a thought *about* a world. Just a very intense one. If you can think of something, it therefore exists, because reality is just a "bright and stable thought". Shifting is then just about letting the current dominant thought fade (detachment and allowing), and having a replacement take root in its place.

Your experience right now is a thought and only exists as a thought; thinking of something means that the something must already exist and that it could become the dominant experience.

> Q: I appreciate the effort you take to answer all these questions you get asked.

Well, the gift that is mobile computing coupled with a love of metaphor mangling means it's not a problem. :-) And it's interesting to try and bring together all the old knowledge into a way anyone can understand, hopefully.

I don't have all the answers of course, and everyone has to prove things to themselves, but I'm always up for sharing my thinking-so-far.

T-Rex Life Invasion

> Q: So really everything? An abstract example: If I can think of a T-Rex, does it mean I could really see a T-Rex outside? Sounds a bit stupid, I know.

Really anything... So if you view everything as a "pattern" or a thought, then the fact that you experience it at all (as a dim sensory image when you contemplate it) means that it truly exists to the same extent as anything else does. There is nothing "behind" your present experience it; it is *only* a bright sensory thought. Therefore absolutely anything could happen. But, you have over time accumulated certain habitual patterns - formatting contexts such as apparent space and time; things you have ingrained which you might call *facts-of-the-world*. This is a good thing, because an unstructured world is no world at all. However, this dictates how much you have to detach in order to have a shift. For instance, most people don't really want "discontinuities" - i.e. things appearing from nowhere - so what tends to happen is that they appear in a way that is "plausible", albeit massively coincidental. Perhaps they really want a particular object, but rather than it just materialising, it'll be in a place that they maybe didn't quite look hard enough, that there's some vagueness about, or a friend coincidentally calls that evening offering a spare one.

You can usually feel your own resistance to stuff. Okay, imagine for a moment a T-Rex appears outside the window. What does that mean for your world? What are the implications? I bet you don't really want them. *But* results are always guaranteed: If you intend a T-Rex with commitment, then you *will* find T-Rexes fill your life, in terms of art and television and overheard conversations and dreams and all sorts of oblique ways too, like news of a fossil discovery...

Which is where the whole idea of experimenting with creating synchronicity and The Owls Of Eternity came from, to demonstrate to ourselves that it is automatic, almost mechanical, and can be very direct...

Direct Avian Incorporation

Random not-great example of directness. Over the weekend I was listening to an ASC podcast about the making of *Twin Peaks*, slightly daydreaming, and there's a whole conversation about the red room scene and how they created the bird shadow within the spotlight. As the host says "bird" I have an image in my mind which clears and there's a bird outside the window exactly in the centre of my field of vision. Not a great example but what I'm trying to convey is the nature of the experience, that when you're detached your thoughts can get directly incorporated into the thought-image of the moment. (Similar to this story. "Found object" stories in general have an element of this.)

You are truly not experiencing a spatially-extended world; there is nothing "happening" except for this current "sensory fact".

Aspects of Extended Persons

>Q: I read yesterday in this forum that we only see other persons as we determine them to be.

We have to be careful with the wording here - we are usually not explicitly specifying other people's traits, they are following "logically" from the pattern of our world we've accumulated to date.

When we shift an element of the world, the world stays self-consistent. If you make the world a friendlier place (say), people's personalities will shift to being nicer, but it'll be the "nice aspect of that person". Other times, people might disappear from your life because they don't have the aspect which corresponds to your intention, without them changing so discontinuously that it's beyond what you find acceptable.

The Evil Persons of Doom

> Q: But what is about people that want to hurt us / kill us, I mean it seems that it doesn't matter since we can't really die (according to some posts I read) but why would I allow this?

The main answer is: your world is stupid. By which I mean, it's just a collection of imagery and it doesn't know what images are "good" or "bad". In Biblical parable terms, the world is "unjust", meaning that it doesn't pass judgement upon your requests, it is actually an automatic and mechanical process.

So if you have a view that the world is a dangerous place, then that pattern is overlaid onto the world and you will have experiences which correspond to (arise from) that pattern. Or bad people might come from the logical implications of another intention, etc.

So you see it's not about "allowing". Like in the bird example, it's simply a case of what you are thinking being superimposed and incorporated into your experience, one pattern on top of another, to make a composite pattern which then unfolds self-consistently.

> Q: It doesn't matter since we can't really die.

The "conscious aware space" that we are is eternal, although all experiences rise and fall. So every moment is a death, in a way, it's just that we can't imagine the *next-moment* that might follow the *last-moment* of this body-pattern. Although we do dream every night, so we should have some clue.

On the whole, I'm still kinda for apparently living a long life in this TG format, I must say. :-)

Haha, yeah, well there's no way to get around that time talk nonsense, so I'm giving myself and "every-one" else a pass on that. :-)

>Q: But they [people and objects] won't disappear like "poof" from my memory or? For example they would say "Hey I got this new Job in New York I have to move away from germany" and disappear like this.

Yes, there would tend to be a plausible story happening. Not because there *has* to be, but because implicitly that's how you're continuing to pattern the world. The more detached you are, the more rapidly these things happen - e.g. next day someone calls up and they're leaving in three hours. It works the other way too: a friend you haven't seen in five years emails two hours after, with a great offer.

> Q: So I can only make objects, for example, appear when it's logical (win the lottery and get a car), but can't say I want a car to "spawn" over there?

But remember that **it's *your* logic that counts.** If you come to truly accept (both in terms of possibility and in terms of allowing) that objects can appear and disappear, then it will become "logical" that this can happen too.

Do you think you can control the clouds just by deciding to? After all, the clouds are simply in your mind so there's nothing stopping you! If you don't really think you can though, then that means you are thinking you can't - and that thought will be true, in your logical worldview. (If that makes sense.)

There's also the thing that your world might shift right now to a different state and you will have no memory of it. Suddenly your green car is red, but there is no trace of it in the world of it ever having been green. If the entire state shifts including personal memory then it's just "always been that way". But that's not worth worrying about (except that you should always have in mind the idea that you want to remember everything that happens).

> Q: I've often wondered exactly how different manifesting and shifting to another diminsion really differ.

Different metaphors for the same thing really: Changing your experience in a way that's beyond your usual. I suppose the different terms suggest different levels of change, how "reality-breaking" they are.

"Manifesting" tends to imply smaller changes apparently coming through normal channels. They can be "plausibly explained" but are just a bit unlikely.

"Shifting" suggests larger changes that you can't really explain away, because they are very hard to explain based on your knowledge of how things were.

Say you lose your wallet somewhere while out shopping (not a great example but let's go with it):

- Manifesting = "a series of coincidences means someone finds it and you get your wallet back". So lucky!
- Shifting = "your wallet materialises on the table, and everyone denies you ever lost it in the first place"

Multidimensional Magick

Introduction

This might be of interest. Several groups of people have tried "world jumping" in the past, using different systems of thought or concepts. Links below are about an approach called *Tesseract* or *Multidimensional Magick*. I've quoted some of the key paragraphs to save you wading through the whole lot. I'd suggest that the details of the process described in the main document aren't so important - it's just another version of the approach 'relax your hold on yourself and the world, allow it to change'. More interesting is the larger context.

Meanwhile, everyone should check out the movies *Coherence*, *The One I Love* and *Safety Not Guaranteed* for inspiration and 'the feel'. Further suggestions from comments elsewhere: Ursula K. Le Guin's *The Lathe of Heaven* and the recent pilot for *The Man in the High Castle* based on the excellent Philip K Dick novel. Ari Folman's movie *The Congress* also captures the notion of alternative simultaneous worlds.

Ebony Anpu & Tesseract Magick

One approach to world-jumping was Ebony Anpu and the Hawk & Jackal system of *Tesseract Magick*. You can read some thoughts about him here. One *Tesseract* story comes from a personal recollection:

> I know that I promised not to tell a tesseract story, but since tesseract magick was probably Ebony's greatest contribution to the technology of Thelema, and because (though a trivial incident in itself) it served to convince me of the evident power of magick to transform one's universe I will include it here after all. I had for some time been hearing incredible reports about the efficacy of Ebony's tesseract workings. Being rather skeptical by nature I was somewhat dubious and didn't at all credit the reports I'd heard.
>
> One day in late 1987 or early 1988 I was visiting at 41st and Opal where I'd often go to rap with Ebony, listen to him play his magnificent, bluesy fuzz guitar, and share some sacrament. The conversation turned to what I'd recently heard about his tesseract workings. He laughed at the reports, but he didn't deny them, and he offered to take me through a tesseract ritual so I could see for myself.
>
> "But you have to be ready for your universe to radically change.", he said. "Can I control how it will change?", I asked. "'fraid not", was his succinct reply. As I was rather satisfied with my universe at the time I declined his offer. "Well, let me just show you what it involves.", he said, and I agreed that just having it explained couldn't do any harm.
>
> So he went over to his desk and brought back a slim calligraphic manuscript. As we sat on the sofa he showed me, step-by-step, how the Hebrew alphabet could be arranged to form the geometry of a tesseract (a "four-dimensional" cube; sort of to the cube what a cube is to the square). As he finished up the explanation he flashed his characteristic smile, devilish and angelic all at the same time, and said, "Oops, looks like I took you through it after all!". I wasn't upset by this, I didn't believe in it anyway, so I went home without expectations or anticipation about how my universe might change.

> That night I set to making dinner, but when I turned the knob to light the burner under my pan of water for the pasta, the burner behind it went on instead. I had been living in this apartment for close on five years. The inner knobs had always lit the front burners and the outer knobs had always lit the back burners. I got one of my room-mates to come and see. "But that's the way it's always been.", he said. No one else remembered it the way I did.
>
> Later that night I called Ebony. He laughed, but he seemed impressed, "You must really be doing your will if that's the only change your universe needed to balance it." Considering some of the horror stories I've heard related I'm grateful that a switch of the oven knobs was all it took to convince me of the reality of magick!
>
> -- *Some memories of Ebony*, Frater Faustus

Multidimensional Magick

Later, the *Tesseract* approach was extended to become the rebranded flavour known as *Multidimensional Magic*, as described in this document.

Some excerpts:

> "We used to call the Multidimensional Magick section Tesseract Magick, after the first of the major innovations in Magick developed by Hawk & Jackal. Since then we have begun doing work in dimensions beyond the fourth."

On the overall effect:

> "There are phenomenon that we should warn you of. Time will sometimes be perceived in a different way immediately before, during, or after a Tesseract.
>
> The effect can be sudden shifts in time or space. Driving a hundred miles in less than 20 minutes. Going through the same stop twice in the same direction on a public transit system. Losing the entire day, someone once skipped their birthday. Distortions in space. Being able to perceive beyond a closed door to the extent that you walk into it. A universe where the sky is red and has green cracks in it. Universes where there is no radio or TV on the air, and there is a smell of ozone in the air (jump again immediately!) People can change eye color, hair color, height, weight, or personality.
>
> Some say that Tesseract jumping is a better version of suicide, and should only be undertaken in the same circumstances. Some say it is habit forming and leads to permanent tourist syndrome toward any universe one finds oneself in."

On jumping and other people:

> "Only those that jump with you can be counted on. Everyone around you and every social circumstance can change rather dramatically in the most highly vectored jumps."

On post-jump stabilisation:

> "Usually in a few minutes, though it may sometimes take a few weeks, your new universe begins to harden and become more cohesive. You quit being able to see through walls and time-space

> distortions become more manageable. Hey don't try to drive until you get used to these effects. Cars have been wrecked. But again lives have been saved as well.
>
> I remember an emergency jump when I was in a car wreck on a skyway, I must have fallen 5 or 6 stories before I felt the jump, and then instantly I was back on the roadway sliding upside down toward the opposite guard rail. I had a broken shoulder but was otherwise all right."

On over-specification:

> "Don't try to manipulate your new universe too much. Micromanagement can really screw things up. Think about it, what if you tried to consciously control your adrenals or the production of endorphins, or every other hormone or drug made in your body, it can be fun but do you really understand how every thing about how you works.
>
> When you are God, and you are when you create a universe, let the automatic systems function normally unless there is a abiding need to interfere, then be prepared for much more than you predicted."
>
> -- *Multidimensional Magick*, Fra. 137

[...]

Well, the tesseract process is super long, but it is basically symbolic anyway (of course) - by representing a 4d space to yourself and by intention 'summoning the experience or feeling' of traversing it, you are essentially just accepting that it is possible and allowing it to happen. Belief matters, unfortunately (where "belief" = entrenched habits of your world).

The 'mirror technique' is really just an approach of detaching from the mirage of your current surroundings, and so letting the underlying patterns shift. You can be more efficient simply by practicing lying down and completely abandoning yourself and the world, and using *assertion*. You can choose a nice metaphor (for me it's blankets and folds, or mirages and dunes in the desert, or it can be tesseracts and hypercubes) to represent the 'jumping' to yourself, or you can simply *intend* new facts into the world.

It's basically "releasing a hold on the patterns of the world, and intending-allowing".

Of course, there is an effect by which established routes by "others" assist your own changes. So the fact that the tesseract system has been set up will assist your own efforts.

> > Q: it's easy to see many similarities ...

Yes, it's all the same thing. It *has* to be, if you think about it. If what we do is based on the truth of the world, then all approaches that produce results *must* be based on the same principles. I suggest that the main principle could be described as: "decisions and permissions".

> > Q: I'm inclined to wonder about the relationship here between manifestation and dimensional jumping. Are they really different? ... Prayer, 'The Secret', focused thought-energy...

In truth, I think you can just brush aside all the explanations. Explanations are *routes to allowing change*, but they are not actually the mechanism of change. Let's just focus instead on what you actually experience.

You do a ritual - 'jumping' or 'focussed-thought' or whatever - and subsequently the apparent world seems to change. Say you want a ticket for an important game of Your Favourite Sport and you perform your favourite bit of magick. Two types of result may be possible:

- Maybe the something you want comes to you by an explainable route - a friend rings up and he has a spare ticket for the game because his wife has left him, great!
- Or *maybe* your world changes in narrative-breaking ways: an object (a ticket for the game!) simply appears out of nowhere; it's just suddenly there on the coffee table. Meanwhile, friends change eye colour and character; geography drifts; the world rebalances.

The only difference between the two is that the second one is an experience that doesn't fit into our usual story about the world. Really, it is simply a shifting of experience in the same way as the first. The latter simply makes it more obvious that *there is no solid, fixed underlying to the world*. An implication of this is more dramatic: That *whatever physical or mental actions you seem to take don't actually matter and have no effect*. All that ritual and visualisation means nothing - well, except what you take it to mean. And that's the key.

All change occurs by simply *deciding-and-allowing*. Meanwhile, the apparent world is always seeking to return to a balanced state. Resistance (identification, beliefs, expectations) prevents this. Intending a change in one aspect will naturally result in a realignment of other aspects, because to get any result at all we need to loosen our hold. Actions simply provide an excuse for allowing; it is how you give yourself permission.

TL;DR: The ways things work is always by "decisions and permissions". You don't notice this because you rarely allow yourself to change radically, or decide ambitiously, in a way that will result in dramatic shifts.

I think that, fundamentally, *all* successful 'magick' is of the "Neville Goddard style":

- Detach from the current facts and experience.
- Assert new facts (until the corresponding *felt-sense* arises...)
- Profit!

How you represent the change to yourself doesn't really matter, so long as it involves relaxed detachment and it generates the *felt-sense* of the new 'reality'.

> Q: Although there's a point at which all the studying must stop, and Faith must rule.

Right. Something that happens with those chasing 'the truth' and those chasing reality changes is that... they end up just talking about it. Putting off the doing. And you can understand: implicitly, everyone knows that realising the truth (dreamlike reality with no solid foundation) or changing experience (transforming the dreamform) corresponds to a sort of death. Everyone wants what the want - except most don't, not really.

I think that making the firm decision (and fully accepting it) is enough. After all, this is what you are doing in daily life anyway. Holding onto some things, letting other things unravel and change. With this approach, you are just *letting go of more*.

Perhaps to make it easier, you could try imagining it in a slightly different way. Rather than imaging jumping dimension via a leap into the void, imagine that right now there are two paths. The left-hand path, no game. The right-hand path, in a short while there will be some new information that shows all is well. The rest of the universe remains untouched.

Get into the right frame of mind. Step onto the right-hand path.

> Q: I'm making the firm decision that The Last Guardian is in fact coming out to store shelves in a month.

Yeah, but you know what'll happen don't you? Magick has a habit of taking your requests *literally*. So you better be very specific in your phrasing. For example:

YOU: "I want *The Last Guardian* to be on store shelves in a month!"

UNIVERSE: In a shocking development, *The Guardian* newspaper goes into bankruptcy, publishing its last edition one month later.

> Q: I wonder if I could make a servitor to automatically re-define the intent of my spells based around its context...

An intermediary usually solves the problem. Actually, what usually happens is that all relevant meanings arise!

[...]

/r/occult/: This is an x-post from /r/DimensionalJumping. It seemed appropriate to their efforts and I was curious about how they'd respond, but it's really more suited as a discussion with the more clued-up audience here. It describes an approach called Tesseract or Multidimensional Magick for jumping universes.

I'd probably offer some extra information: When "jumping" you are effectively allowing the structures and patterns of your experience to shift by letting go and allowing. This involves the enfolded "universe" of your mind, consisting of the environment but *also* the body and thoughts which appear to you. *Any* pattern that you don't "hold onto" can shift and realign!

This means:

- When you jump you are not just allowing the effective death of your original universe but also of the "person" you have been experiencing as "yourself" until this point. It is worth considering at what stage you are simply no longer "you" and have effectively committed suicide to be resurrected as someone else, because...
- Once you've jumped once, and seen changes, you will no longer be "home". Before, you accepted imperfections as just part of your solid external world. Having let things shift, you realise there is no such thing. Everything is up for grabs, and you can't go back now! "Tweaking for perfection" could become an obsession.

Sometimes, acceptance may be the better route since the balancing effects of narrowly focusing on one particular change after another might not lead to a beneficial result overall.

> Q: I'm reading it more like 'the patterns you willingly release can shift and realign'

That's an equally valid way to say it too. The reason I phrased it my way was to imply that the natural state is of letting go and that "holding on" is you resisting change unnaturally. Perhaps that's how you ended up in an undesirable universe in the first place, by blocking the direct manifestation of your desires?

> Q: ...it turns the concept of faith, something that's often so difficult to get past, into a given and makes one focus instead on what their faith produces. thanks for posting

Yes. I think it captures a few solid ideas into one handy worldview/system, including resistance, identity and True Nature and all that stuff. Had the links for a while but only thought of them again when I spotted /r/DimensionalJumping. (I've been experimenting more with a direct "enfolding, unfolding dreamlike mind-space" type format of late, but actually that fits in quite well with the Multidimensional/Tesseract symbolism.)

> Q: words are the trouble, like usual.

Pesky words! Okay, I'm going to try and explain my choice better: I'd say that you can only know what you are holding onto, not know what you are *not* holding onto - you can't make a list of all the things you you don't know you don't know - and that's the problem with this approach. You might make a list of what you *want* to change. But those aren't the only things that *will* change. Anything that you aren't holding down will shift, subtly or dramatically depending on how extreme the main movements are.

Blanket Metaphor Time

Imagine the world was a blanket (yeah, I love the blanket metaphor) with loads of 'bumps' or 'folds' in it at different heights, representing the current objects of the world. You are one of the bumps, with a limited viewpoint. You've seen some of the other bumps, but not all. You decide to change the shape of two of the adjacent bumps you can see, while holding on to two of the other bumps. Great, yeah? Well, no.

When those two bumps change shape, say grow taller, they pull on the fabric of the blanket. Sure, the two bumps you are holding onto stay the same, and you get the changes you want, but everything else that falls outwith your scope in the world is subtly "pulled". Door handles may turn the other way now; the colour of Alfred's hair might be lighter; Nelson Mandela is alive yet again; Berenstoon Bears. No big deal?

Thing is, lots of other "folds" might have been teetering on the edge of more dramatic change. Several 'bumps' that were adjacent to each other are pulled into a single form, or one pushes into the other, collapsing it...

At the other end of the blanket to your bump/perspective, a chain reaction has started, the effects of which may not fall into your line-of-sight for days. All because you held onto (prevented the change of) one aspect of the world, keeping it static against the larger flow you have requested and so interfering with the normal self-consistency or "coherence" of the whole.

Summary

- We can list the things we are holding onto: that list is finite and within our perspective. We can't list the things we *aren't* holding onto: that list is infinite and beyond our scope.
- To make *any* change it is *required* that other things are allowed to change also, because each object is part of a seamless whole. Any changes that do occur "pull at" the rest of the world as part of the process.
- Artificially restricting change may destroy the previous narrative coherence and lead to more dramatic, unintended changes to compensate for it.
- It is therefore not possible to consciously control the details of the jumping process.

Rejigged my description to make it flow better. Obviously, by making this change I may have inadvertently caused other aspects of the world to be altered. If the hair colour of your SO shifts overnight and they develop a hitherto-unlikely love of cornflakes & peanut butter for breakfast, you can blame me.

> [Q: that makes perfect sense - can't go wrong with the blanket metaphor. *BUT* (you knew there was a 'but' coming) - how can you really 'hold on' to anything? As a made up example that hopefully illustrates what I'm thinking: There's a boy named Tom, and Tom's life is shitty - objectively shitty. We're in an example here, so let's make it as bad as can be. He was born into a North Korean prison camp, and at that, for whatever reason, his position is as low as can be. He routinely gets beat, raped, starved, whatever you can imagine in such a horrible place. Everything is really, truly terrible, and trumps the worst that a 'normal' life dishes out. Everything except for this certain bird that always lands on the barbed wire fence and sings beautiful songs. Tom gets lost in that bird's song, it's the only thing that gives him peace, or love, or hope or joy - maybe it's the only emotion that he feels, since pain and cold and hunger aren't really emotions. Imagine Andy in the Shawshank redemption with the opera song. Like that but worse, right? For the sake of exposition, let's say that one day there's an older man dying and Tom happens to be around him while it's happening. He's pulls Tom close and tells him something similar to this:
>
> > [**Korrin85 - DimensionalJumping Mirror Story**
> >
> > When I was about 16, I was friends with four other dudes. Since some of them have reddit accounts, we'll Ron, Harry, Neville, and Dean.
> >
> > Now while hanging out one day, Dean told the story his father always told him. According to his father, he "accidentally" traveled to another dimension when he was in trouble. Dean's father was being abused by his father and during a really bad scene, ran and hid in his room. He locked himself in the closet. In his closet was a door mirror. Dean's father, in a bout of fear only a six year old can feel when an abuser is coming closer to you, leaned against the mirror and in a desperate moment, begged and pleaded to be let in to the "other side" (the reflection).
> >
> > According to his father, right when he was about to be found, Dean's father fell through into the other side. Startled, he watched in amazement as his "reflection" was grabbed and taken away by Dean's father.
> >
> > After this event, Dean's father described his dad as the most respectable man he ever knew. He never laid a hand on him again. It was like a different person.
> >
> > Hearing this story from Dean made us want to try it ourselves. So, for a little over a year, we developed a technique to help "cross over" to other dimensions. So here's our guide!
> >
> > I would like to start off by saying, this was developed by five teenage dudes so be careful. You're not going to do this and end up in a dimension where Hitler never died but it's still very dangerous. "Shifting" to other dimensions causes small changes, but those small changes can have big impacts. For example, you might end up in a universe where your wife loves you just slightly less, which can result in her cheating on your ass. So do this at your own risk. These are small jumps. Sometimes you can see the change right away while other times it's very small. The more you shift, the more changes occur.

> Finally, none of us could ever find out how to get back to our original dimensions! It's permanent. Once you shift you can not shift back! Use at your own risk!!!]
>
> Obviously Tom doesn't have much to lose, but he wants to hold on to that bird. What does he really know about it? Its song? The shape of its body? The way it makes him feel? How can any of these things be more than an 'imagining' and how to 'hold on' to such a wispy thing? Even if he could - does he know where the bird lives? How and where it hatched? What it eats? If any of *those* things change - possibilities all of them, since no doubt he'll be wishing for a change of scenery to say the least - how can that bird still be there?
>
> /example
>
> It's similar, in a way to Zeno's paradox - no matter how much you 'have' (there's an interesting wording) of something to 'hold on' to - the shape of the bird, it's song, the way it makes you feel, etc - you'll never have it all. There's ***always*** something missing, always something lost. So - when you say 'you can only know what you are holding onto', and I think your argument for that was quite sufficient, what then? Tom knows that he's holding onto the bird, but *how* does Tom hold on to the bird?]

That was a nice piece of storytelling and a great point! Nice when a discussion teases out the issues like this. To recap:

- What does it mean to hold onto something and how do we know what we are holding onto? And:
- If everything is continuous and whole then how can we hold onto a "part" of it? In other words, how do we define the perimeter of an object? Do we actually need to?

How does Tom "access" the bird and retain it in its current form when everything else is going to shift? To answer this, we're going to have to push a little into the nature of the world. The blanket metaphor is handy for showing interconnectedness, but of course it implies a 'spatiality' that is not actually present. For this next part, we must dispense with it and realise that in actual fact the whole universe isn't out there, extended, but enfolded into the space right here – *intended?*

Well, we're going a bit deeper than I'd initially meant to, but let's go with it and see where we end up, shall we?

Before we offer advice to Tom about his situation, I think we have to talk a little more about what the world is, how it appears to us and how we interact with it. Obviously, we'll still be trapped within metaphor, but with some juggling we can work our way onwards - and arrive at a *practical* approach for him.

Beyond the Blanket: Into the Desert

Where is the world right now? It is not "out there". I suggest that the world is enfolded into the space *right here*. We talk of the conscious and the subconscious, as if the subconscious was beyond our awareness, unavailable and secret, but it is not. We are simply being biased towards one form of experience versus another as being "real". We attend to sights and sounds and textures while ignoring another sense that we have: the background and ever-present *felt-sense.* This *felt-sense* contains - no *is* - the world enfolded. It has no spatial or temporal structure but all aspects are within it. And what we think of as the present moment experience is simply an aspect or perspective of the *felt-sense*, unfolded into images, sounds, sensations.

Literally, we have a sense of the world and it turns out that this actually is the world.

One can think of the experience around you as a *mirage* that is floating above the sand dunes of a desert floor. We confuse the mirage with the real world, when in fact the form of the world-mirage reflects the shape of the sand dunes below. We cannot interact with the mirage directly, although we may be fooled into thinking so; in fact, we can only change the dunes and see those changes reflected in the mirage. Although we might experience single moments as unfolded sensory experience, in truth we simultaneously have access to all time and all space via the dunes. So, in everyday life we actually make changes by *intending* alterations of the timeless dune landscape. We might intend our arm to move right now, and it will, and we will feel that we "did something". However, we could equally intend that our arm move tomorrow, and when tomorrow comes it will seem to happen then. Strictly speaking though, it was *always happening* that day, from the moment we intended it.

In our metaphor, the mirage is the multi-sensory present moment experience, the sand dunes represents the felt-sense, and what we truly are is the entirety of the desert landscape. When we intend what we are actually doing is *shifting our own shape*; we *become* the world we subsequently hallucinate. The world, in other words, is ourselves. This accounts for its occasionally dreamlike nature: the apparently external world is in fact symbolic of our current state. Or to be more accurate, our current state is symbolic in nature. We don't need to delve into this to solve our current predicament. Suffice to say that the objects we encounter are in fact *meanings*. To finish off, we note that just as all objects were actually continuous forms of a whole in the blanket metaphor, here all objects are dissolved non-spatially and non-temporally into the *felt-sense*. The difference now is that our metaphor suggests a way we can interact with the world practically.

A. *Can* Tom hold onto the bird?

So, armed with his new metaphor, how can Tom change his situation while holding onto the bird that has given him so much comfort?

First we must decide what it means to "hold on". This is easy enough now: since the patterns of the world are the patterns of ourselves, we simply need to intend - basically, just decide - that a pattern is going to persist. We do this accidentally all the time, by implication. (For instance, *identification* with something implies a resistance to change because you 'stand as that thing'.) Here, we are simply doing it deliberately.

However, importantly, one can only make deliberate decisions about things that are unfolded as objects in awareness. Tom can easily unfold "the bird" from his background sense and intend it will persist - simply by recalling it and making the decision. He cannot do so to aspects which have not yet been object-ified, though.

So, Tom decides that the bird will persist and then relaxes completely. He 'gives up to God' as it were, and intends that his situation shifts to the best possible one. With the bird still present.

B. *Should* Tom hold onto the bird?

The thing is - if the whole world is shifting for his benefit, it's not clear he should retain the bird. The bird fulfilled a particular purpose: it gave him comfort when the rest of his situation was dire. Now that he has allowed his situation to flow towards a better one, the bird will no longer have the meaning it once had. In fact, it is likely that Tom's feelings towards the bird will be quite different. He might have gratitude towards the bird, but he no longer has a requirement for it. Which sounds harsh. The poor bird!

But what is the bird anyway? The bird was its *meaning* - of hope and escape. It was the aspect of him that knew there was another way. The bird was his pathway to changing the world and with the world changed, the bird has no place. The bird was actually an aspect of Tom all along, and can now be allowed to dissolve back into his awareness.

Conclusion

A key word here might be "realignment". Why would we want a world which was part changed and part not, a partial alignment to a new existence? An incoherent world means an incoherent self and experience. In other words, it is not clear that Tom should hold onto anything. Perhaps he should actually let go completely of all patterns in awareness - let the winds of destiny shape his desert floor consistently and naturally - if what he really wants is “the best thing for Tom”.

Afterword

So, how does this apply to the specific workings in the original post? Well, it suggests that the details of the working are a symbolic representation of >3-dimensional space, and stepping from one part of the tesseract to another represents a 'releasing into' parallel possibilities. In other words, the important thing is the understanding and opening to this type of change, rather than the details of the diagrams and so on.

The *felt-sense* I have described *has* no dimensions and no limitations, except those placed upon it by the intentions enfolded into it. Recognition of this alone will improve your experience of the world - i.e. yourself.

I'll begin by saying that my original posting doesn't necessarily recommend performing Multidimensional Magick; it just points out an interesting approach. For me, it's as much about how it illuminates the nature of experience. With that in mind, we're going to push it to the extreme.

Why Jump?

It may well be that "stoic acceptance" is a better approach to life rather than expose oneself to an unpredictable process that one cannot fully guide. However, what would it mean to guide, to know in advance, what was going to change? We wouldn't actually want to have to go through each aspect of the the world individually and adjust it. The key here is to ask what the nature of the change is going to be.

What's really happening?

1. We're *letting go* of the world so that it can shift.
2. We're *intending* certain changes.
3. We're *allowing* the world to shift to accommodate those changes.
4. In the process of that accommodation, the world *rebalances* as a whole.

So, potentially we get something we want and simultaneously everything becomes more harmonious at the same time. The more we try to control the details consciously, the less coherent and harmonious the result is.

To ponder: What if we just didn't do the intention, and simply let go completely? Might that perhaps give us not what we want - but what we *really, really* want? In other words, the question might be not so much about whether we jump, but whether we *control* the jump at all.

It's not Solipsism

Solipsism is when we think the "person" we are is the only person on the world. This is something different. In one sense we are saying that the whole world *is* the person. Taking it a step further, we realise there is no "person", there are no "people", there is only the world. You and I are both the world.

It can be hard to reconcile this mentally with an idea of a "you". One approach is to think of each of us as our own dreamworlds, which are connected at some higher dimensionality. In other words, an *intersubjective idealism*.

For practical purposes, you can just treat "all this" as your dream, with you being the dreamer, the dream and all its content. The "person" you seem to be is a dream character, just as the other people you encounter. Since "everything is you", you will not behave solipsistically, you will not be cruel to yourself.

Tom Falls into the Mirror

All your ideas about changing oneself, bettering oneself, escaping oneself - all of those ideas depend on what one thinks of as "oneself". Without having that clear first, we cannot really weigh up the pros and cons of apparent suffering vs transformation. One of the problems with Tom's story and our interpretation at the moment is that we are talking about "Tom" as if he is separate from his world. We talk of *meaning* and what the world means *to* Tom. This isn't quite the correct wording though: The world is literally parts of what Tom really is. Tom *is* the world; "Tom-the-person", meanwhile, is just a perspective and a collection of thoughts within that world. When Tom sees war and catastrophe, that is not just a representation of Tom's inner turmoil, it is literally part of Tom, unfolded into sensory experience.

> Q: ...what now? he's not getting beaten or starved anymore, but surely his sanity must be in tatters? we can assume he lands in a 'real' place. His mom is gone. In fact, to the world he finds himself in, it's as though she never existed. The thing which made his life possible is irreparably lost.

But the thing that made Tom's life possible was not "his Mother", she was just an aspect of the experience. What would happen in this extreme case is that Tom would be confronted with his true nature: He is an "aware space" in which experience arises.

He is not any of the content of his experience. He is the background in which experiences appear. He had forgotten this, assuming an external world and that tone part of experience - his thoughts and body sensation - were "him". Was the jump worth it? Would he be God?

Being God: Would ya?

One worry people might have is that, effectively, this sort of magick implies that one can be God. More worryingly, it implies that one *already is* God. Before they've thought about the implications, people quite like the idea of Infinite Power. Actually it might not be so attractive - it could get boring pretty quick. It's *cheating*. It breaks down what we think is important in our lives.

- If you could change anything instantly, without going through an apparent process, it means you could do anything and have anything. It would just happen. (God.)

- Or you might change things to you liking, but choose to forget that it was different - i.e. you deliberately forget that you used your Godly Power to update the world and make it nice. Just so you could enjoy it all more. (God + Memory Wipe.)
- Alternatively, you might say it's okay to have what you want and remember asking for it, but you're going have those things arrive through seemingly normal channels. In fact, you will have updated the world to get what you want, but you will experience it as happening via coincidence and opportunity. (Magick in the World.)
- Another option is to hide from yourself the fact that you get what you want. You simply always get what you ask for, but never realise it. You live a life of struggle and triumph, terror and joy, and only at the end will you realise it was your own creation; you were chasing your own shadows in a fictional grand adventure. (Powerless Person.)

At any point, one might "realise" themselves from one situation to another via insight. The Powerless Person might notice that, hey, something is going on here -> Magick in the World. They might later realise they aren't a person at all, and are effectively the world itself! For a while, you become God. Then you get bored of that, and decide that you'll make everything ideal, but then forget that you did it (God + Memory Wipe).

Then you're back to Powerless Person...

Conclusion

Aurelius has it right. As he implies, the world is yourself pushed out. All change is to the self. Live from the perspective of a person, but understand this is not the case. Objects appear and disappear; they are patterns in experience. The universe is transient and it is made from meaning. But that meaning *is you*.

> *Q: What do you think is going on.*

When you ponder it for a bit, it actually makes sense that there should be changes on a global scale. Although I always scoffed a bit at the optimism of this in my early days, think about it: When you become clearer about things yourself, you effectively dissolve the boundaries between your personal self and the world (realising they are the same things). Meaning that the barriers between your own thoughts and intentions and everyone else are greatly reduced. If *you* have "realised" how things are, you help everyone else (also you really) realise the same thing.

> Q: So you're saying that all those steps basically get boiled down to: allow the world to shift

Once you look at what you're actually doing: yes. At first though, we might *think* we are going through various steps, thinking things through, deciding what we want (as if we don't already know deep down), choosing something then letting go, letting it happen. The four steps I listed. But we only need to do that because we went off track at some point. In the end, what we're really aiming for is a state where we're balanced, and our desires and the world are aligned anyway. No resistance.

If we hadn't "fallen" at some point during our lives - started pushing and pulling instead of flowing - we wouldn't feel the need to do magick in the first place. Our world would be us, effortlessly, whereas currently its movement is busy fighting through our defences. However, while we still feel we've got things to "work through", there will still be stuff to "be done".

> Q: correct me if I'm wrong - you're going down a sort of Alan Watts path of "God playing hide-go-seek with itself"

Well, I don't really like that angle because of its anthropomorphism and I don't quite see us as a part of anything. But I'm struggling to describe it at the moment.

> Q: Is there such a thing as transformation?

There's such a thing as a change in perspective and identification. Do you think one *should* have to work hard for the goodies? Might that not be like rippling the water in the hope of clearing view to the bottom of the stream? Implicitly there are different levels to these conversations:

First, everything is as it is already, so let things be. You are already whatever you are, you don't need to do anything to get there. *Life* will forcibly unravel you and make you clear (since the world is you and it tends toward harmony).

Second, yes but... can I make it happen? Then there are two options: Accelerate the process by deliberately searching out and working through aspects of yourself, analytically or experientially. Or quicker: Just drop straight to the non-resistance level, including letting go of more structured beliefs, and deal with the massive shift.

The middle ground is *intended* shifts with the "collateral damage" of partial reharmonisation. (Or perhaps you could just *intend* to Be God Now, thanks.)

Which you choose depends on what you're aiming for and what results you want in the interim. Are you looking for harmony, a nice car, total annihilation and rebirth, or what - for instance.

> Q: a cover for not having the perseverance to really push through whatever it is...

But is the "pushing through" not just a bit of theatre? Something we just play at, which actually has nothing to do with seeing how things are or changing ourselves. You do all this stuff on the stage, getting your performance just right, so that you eventually allow yourself to exit stage right and go out into the street.

> Q: the narrative by-products of the system one chooses to live by.

That's very interesting. Is it that the basic truth is fashioned into a narrative, which implies a worldview which then impacts the behaviour of followers and therefore the world? In other words, the end-point might be the same for all (originally) but the extra "prove you're worth it" path each organised religion sets its followers (rather than *just* saying let go and have faith) actually mutates the teachings and causes collateral damage. There's somethng in that (if I've followed you correctly).

> Q: if I'm a zen superhero and I can accept everything in my life with equanimity, what about the people around me and how it affects their lives? what about my kid who was depending on me to get food on the table?

Well, the position isn't so extreme. What you describe there is a "selfish solipsism", but most teach a compassionate stance. After all, you have worldly responsibilities ("chop wood, carry water") and Shiva looks out the eyes of all. It's not nihilism. Tibetan Dream Yoga, for instance, is very specific that - yeah, it's all a dream, but you still have dream bills and dream gravity, and the dream bankruptcy or dream impact won't be any more pleasant for them being part of a dream! Rambling's good.

> Q: ...have you ever read the term "tesseract" used to describe journey work?

I was familiar with it as a mathematical shape - a 4-dimensional hypercube - and as a way of representing time diagrammatically (and in crap films!) before I came across this, but hadn't seen it used as a concept in other esoteric practices. But I think the overall approach is intimately linked with practices involving inner and outer.

> Q: Could changes be a subtle as a plant growing where it was not growing previously?

Exactly this. Let's explore!

The World is You

What if we look at the world as your extended self; in its entirety it is your true self. If you change one part of the world, there will be corresponding adjustments elsewhere, in two senses:

1. The sense of it being a continuous material.

   If you tug on one section of a blanket of material, other parts of it will get changed also. If you create a new fold in one area, other folds will be changed: they will be pulled to a new location, may combine with other folds, or even collapse completely into the flat background. *Self-balancing*.

2. The sense that all of the world is *meaning*, is an aspect of you.

   When when you change the form of yourself, the world will correspond to that (because it *is* that). For instance, having a clear sense of self you may notice that the skies literally have less clouds in them. When you have a clear idea of what you want in life, you might that the winding path into the village literally has less stones or pot-holes than it used to; it might even now be a straighter path. *Self-presentation.*

The essence of *Multidimensional Magick* is also that of changing the enfolded aspects of the "inner self" because the "outer world" is just an unfolded image of that. The limits of what can happen depend on the balance of *intention* and of *letting go* - "decisions and permissions". But how?

Inner and Outer

This sounds a bit vague initially, because we are left with wondering what/where that "inner self' is. Actually, it's right here right now.

- The "outer world" is the present moment's sights, sounds, textures, thoughts - which all arise in one mind-space. These experiences are transparent, mirages, and cannot actually be changed directly.
- The "inner world" is the subtle background *felt-sense* you have. Everything is enfolded into that. *This* is what you change with magick.

The thoughts that arise to you and the objects you encounter are both just experiences and both come from the same place, unfolding from this *felt-sense*. So to change yourself *is* to change the world, and vice versa.

Attempt at illustrating that and the feedback-loop nature of experience in this diagram. The unfolded is experienced as sensory objects; the enfolded is experienced as the *felt-sesne*.


Enfolded Form
- Residual pattern built up from previous experiences, subject to direct intention
"Experiential Mind-Space"
Unfolded Object
- Experience snaps to and unfolds in alignment with enfolded forms, spontanously and automatically

Fig 1. An illustration of the relationship between enfolded forms (belief, expectation, memory traces) and unfolding experience. In an ongoing feedback process, experiences leave traces which then in-form the structure of subsequent experiences, as spatial and temporal structures - i.e. objects and narrative, respectively. To change the nature of experience requires exposure of the ground to alternative types of experience ("external" change) or a shifting of the form of the ground directly ("internal" or first-cause change).

The Underlying Process

So really, I think all magickal processes involve releasing our hold on the mirage of the moment to better connect with the *felt-sense*. It is always there, just as the stars are in the sky even at noon, they are just obscured by the brightness of the sun.

At that point, *any* intention will shift the enfolded structure, subject to your beliefs and identifications. Basically, we "insert new facts" into the universe at the lowest level. The more you let go of holding onto any particular pattern the more the *felt-sense*, and therefore the world, can shift. Most people have quite a tight hold of their personal self and of certain basic rules of reality - not to mention that many basic rules have now become quite deeply entrenched as "habits of the world" - which limits what might happen.

Fundamentally though, there might be no true limit. And even minor changes could lead to instant changes. Perhaps this explains the stories in /r/Glitch_in_the_Matrix, for instance. (The ones that aren't just dreams and forgetfulness, that is.)

TL;DR: All magick is changing your self-world. Any changes to your self changes the world; any change you see in the world *is* a change in your self. This includes plants growing in unusual locations.

In effect, it's another conceptualisation of possibility. In truth, it's just a scheme by which we might allow ourselves to intend over all time-and-space, across the entire enfolded world. There are no actual dimensions

and realities and many-worlds or whatever. Rather, there are inter-subjective minds. And the intersubjectivity is not a limited sort; it doesn't restrict possibiliites.

It's actually not solipsistic but I think that in general for a stable world you need a stable posture, as it were. By which I mean that we are not fluctuating between detached relaxation and narrowed attention, mixing releasing and pushing.

Overwriting Yourself

Overwriting Yourself

It is fun to contemplate reality from the perspective of idealism and subjectivity, and talk of consciousness as an undivided whole. Imagining the world as a dream-like experience which might be subject to one's will can trigger in us all sorts of exciting possibilities. However, it's one thing to dream *about* a dream in this way; it's quite another to knowingly *dream the dream* itself. Is it even truly possible, or is it just a fun and comforting idea? How can we get there when our everyday experience doesn't quite correspond to this ideal? One approach is to attempt to directly alter our experience to conform to it.

The Experiential Dream-Space

If it is true at all that reality is dream-like then it must be true *right now*. In the room you are apparently in, at this very moment. So look around. Furthermore, your own body and thoughts must themselves be dreamed, along with every other experience you are having. All of this must be arising within an open "dream space" made of mind, of awareness. All of this experience is "you"! It doesn't usually feel that way though, does it? Why not? Even if we understand intellectually that everything is consciousness and the world is undivided, we still usually *feel* that there is an inner and an outer to experience, that we are "located" and separate, except during certain peak experiences. What is the nature of this feeling? Can we tackle it directly? I say we can.

Stuck Thoughts, Incomplete Movements

I suggest this disconnect arises because over time we accumulate forms of "experiential debris" in our dream-space. The ideas we accept, the thoughts we have, the other encounters in the world whether passive or active - all leave traces which, when repeated and reactivated, gradually solidify. There are many implications of this, but the important ones at the moment are:

- ***Stuck Thoughts***. These are basically thought structures that have solidified in your space rather than naturally dissolve. These may be located in your body area or beyond. This sense of division between body and world is one such thought.
- ***Incomplete Movements.*** These are intentions which were resisted or aborted before they followed through to completion. This might be a suppressed startle response, a decision to do something which you then halted by tension or a reverse intention, and so on.

Neither of these would arise or be a problem if we lived in open non-resistance. However, most of us are holding on to - identifying with - certain patterns in awareness, and this prevents the natural passing and dissolving of these structures. This leads to a sense of clutter and constraint (stuck thoughts) and tension (incomplete movements).

Subtle Identity, Subtle Boundary

Although all held structures interfere with our direct appreciation of the dream-like experience, there are two particular ones which being subtle are often overlooked:

- The first is the *Subtle Identity*. This is a sense of location, usually somewhere along the centre line of the body. It is a "stuck thought" which consists only of a felt-sense. It is where you feel "me" to be, even as you obviously experience it from outside - i.e. "me" is experiencing "it".
- The second is the *Subtle Boundary*. This often corresponds to what is perceived as one's "personal space". As with the identity, it is a subtle felt-sense, a three-dimensional structure felt as a subtle "wall" between one area of the dream-space and the rest. Again, it consists only of a located feeling.

The key to directly experiencing the undivided nature of your world is to at least recognise, and ideally dissolve, these two structures.

Releasing Held Structures

There are three general approaches to releasing these structures, ranging from passive to fully active:

- ***Passive.*** Simply lie on the floor each day for about 10 minutes. Completely let go to gravity, and allow your body and thoughts to move as they will. If you find your attention narrowed on some aspect of experience, simply let go of holding your attention. Let it roam as it will. Gradually, over quite a long period, your held patterns will unravel naturally. However, you will feel benefits of increased clarity almost immediately, as the most shallow structures evaporate rapidly.
- ***Investigative.*** In this approach, you actively sense out difficult areas and release them. Sometimes we know there is a particular problem that needs tackled, other times we might scan our bodies or larger space and seek them out. Either way, we approach this task with an open, relaxed attention. Having identified a particular stuck area, we "sit with it" and let it intensify and release into the background of its own accord.
- ***Active-Assertive.*** The more extreme version is to go straight for the desired result. Residual structures are accumulated over time, a deformation of the nature open, empty experience that we began with. Instead of gradually diffusing these structures, we can instead *wilfully assert open space as our experience*.

  To do this, we allow our attention to open out and be unbounded: expand into the whole body space, the room, and beyond. We take our stand as the *background space* in which patterns appear. We then simply *assert* - declare to ourselves as fact, summon the feeling of it being true - that we are experiencing complete open, structureless space.

  You will immediately feel the contrary to this: it is not yet true and so you will be very aware of the elements of experience which are not open and empty. Reality will offer its counter-assertion! Regardless, you simply stay with this posture of assertion and sit with it. Gradually, the resistance will soften. With regular practice, you will rapidly approach a clearer more, open experience - the subtle identity and boundary will become particularly obvious to you, and soften subsequently. However, a sense of expanded space and looser division will be almost immediate.

  Important: You are asserting the *feeling of truth* of this directly into the dream-space here, rather than merely *thinking-about* it.

Note that with the final approach, you are effectively *overwriting yourself with empty space*. As such, it is natural that you will encounter quite strong resistance and even a sense of existential fear. For this reason, it is

probably better to start with one of the other methods, build up to this, and begin with only "light assertion" until you become acclimatised to the experience.

Afterword - This process is closely related to the interrelationship of arising experience, creativity and memory formation.

[...]

Stuck in your Head

> Q: After lying still for a while, I felt like I was 'stuck' in my head.

That's usually the first impression people seem to get, and it can be surprising. People meditate, work on letting their thoughts pass and so on, get some success - all the while not realising they have circumscribed their world into this little area. It doesn't really give any 'content' much room to arise and dissolve - no wonder people find themselves so "thinky". They are effectively "clenching their being" constantly. And tense, unmoving patterns spew out thoughts, no matter where they are in the body-space. Another side-effect is that they are living their lives in "blind-sight". You are not truly out there in the world, you are only seeing it through a peripheral view, actually experiencing your *thoughts-about* rather than your *direct-sensing*.

> Q: I have some history with the 'fourth way' of Gurdjieff/Ouspensky as well which is also related

Now, I've read a little of Gurdjieff, but never really pursued it. It was going to take a bit more dedication to it than I could muster at the time, although it seemed pretty fascinating (I was looking into the Alexander Technique at the time).

Attention is not a Torch

> Q: What I mean by this 'stuck' feeling is that 'all' of my consciousness was sort of balled up there. Do you have any suggestions for moving it around? To the bottom of my feet, for example, or the corner of the room?

I know exactly what you mean. To get clear - because your "consciousness" is actually always everywhere - let's call it "attention" for now. The problem you have is that your default "attentional profile", its extent in space, has become defaulted and constrained to a certain area. You can temporarily force it out, but it'll spring back for two reasons:

1. You are trying to *move* it, when attention is not something that is to be moved - because it is not thing. The metaphor of the torch-light is incorrect, it is more like a 3-dimensional spatial filter, a "profile varying the intensity of experience across space".
2. You have accumulated structure/habit in your world where your attentional profile always settles into that shape, that location, probably with a 'felt-sense' boundary. Basically, you've ended up with a little "valley" in this area of your world.

Okay, the three methods described in the post are pretty much *for* this. First of all, adopt this assumption: Your natural state is to be completely open, without even an attention boundary - no localisation.

Following the passive approach regularly (in which you *don't* concentrate, simply let go), your tensions and division would eventually unfold by themselves, and your attention would become increasingly open. But this takes patience, and you have to do it every day, and you have to not mistreat yourself (by forcing and pushing) in between times, ideally. The secret to doing this more deliberately is: You do not *move* your attention to an area of experience, rather you *expand it to include that experience* in your area of attention. The area you include doesn't need to be adjacent - what you are effectively doing is "increasing the intensity of attention at that point" - but it's initially helpful if it is.

So, next time you're lying down, discovering you are constrained into your head area, let it be. Then *feel out* the tips of your toes, and include them. Gradually, *feel out* your whole body, bit by bit, in this way. Then *feel out* the space around you body, and beyond.

Remember, you are not really moving or expanding consciousness - that is already everywhere, what your experience is and is made of. You are basically including aspects of experience more fully in attention, and eventually dissolving the boundary of attention - the habitual valley - completely.

Switching Perspective

Now, this approach is focussed on the content. It *is* possible to short-cut this by switching perspective to the background space in and of which content arises.

Once you know that you are really the whole space, you can just switch perspective to it. That doesn't mean all the debris disappears instantly, but it stops being troublesome, you are opened-out, and the debris will even be slightly loosening during daily activity while you are in this mode. The author Greg Goode has referred to this as *Standing As Awareness*, in the book of the same name.

Another quick shortcut is to include in your attention an external sound, such as distant traffic. Sounds are more discrete that images, and so attending to a sound often draws you to, and releases you into, the silence surrounding it. Finally, including (not focussing, remember) the sensation of space just behind your forehead (where "your pre-frontal lobes would be"), can also help, since the thought-generation tends to occur nearer the back of your head-space.

In general, then, we want to avoid deliberately narrowing our attention, and find ways to encourage and allow it to open up without force - since force tends to paradoxically fix the current pattern in place.

Further Reading

A martial artist called Peter Ralston has a nice phrase, "feeling-awareness", that he uses for this "sensing out" approach, and covers some nice exercises in his book. You might find it interesting. You might also be interested in the work of Les Fehmi on open/narrow focussed attention.

And here is a nice illustration from a review of Marion Milner's book, *A Life of One's Own*, which captures it somewhat.


SHE FINDS SHE CAN SOMETIMES EXTEND HER AWARENESS AROUND THINGS AND GRASP THEIR REALITY IN A WAY THAT ELUDED HER BEFORE.
GRADUALLY SHE COMES TO DISCERN TWO WAYS OF LOOKING: WIDE, DISINTERESTED PERCEPTION AND NARROW, QUESTING, SELF-INTERESTED PERCEPTION.

> Q: Somewhat unrelated, have you read 'The Great Book of Amber' by Zelzany?

No, not heard of it. Fancy giving me some highlights? I've been mostly re-reading old favourites from Philip K Dick, Haruki Murakami and JG Ballard lately to get me in the imaginative mood. (Latest: *Eye in the Sky*, a PKD I'd never even heard of, and quite relevant to the subjective idealist platform of this subreddit.)

> Q: quick update - i did what you suggested, and i had a feeling of 'largeness' - i'm not sure how else to describe it. like i was a big ship in the ocean instead of me in my bed. very interesting. thanks

There you go! Great. :-) Imagine having that as a part of your daily experience. It's pretty hard to build up tension and fear and resistance, while also being so 'open'.

[...]

> Q: What sort of exciting possibilities has this unlocked for you?

Puppeteer of the dream-space.

The Patterning of Experience

The Patterning of Experience

This is just a quick bullet-point summary of the memory-pattern-based view of experience, plus guidelines for selecting experiences. I have a more expanded description but I haven't written it up yet (and it's probably not required here). You might use it in conjunction with the Imagination Room metaphor and the *Imagining That* post to help provide context.

The Static

- What you really are is an open space of awareness.
- Dissolved into the background, implicitly, are all the patterns that ever were, although they are only very subtly present and barely activated.
- Your background *felt-sense* is the global sense of all the patterns you are holding on to (the *facts-of-the-world*).
- All sensory experience is the *effortless and spontaneous* arising of patterns in alignment with the *felt-sense*. The shifting of the *felt-sense* is how we actually select experience.

The Dynamic

- The content of the senses and your apparent history have no *necessary* impact on what happens next, if you are detached from them.
- All that matters is the patterns you are holding onto right now.
- If you trigger a pattern it will subsequently arise in your experience (both thoughts and senses).
- Recalling or experiencing part of a pattern in any way triggers the whole pattern (and to a lesser extent all associated patterns) via *auto-completion*.
- Every imagining is a 1st-person pattern and all bring about an experience:
    - If you imagine doing something from a 1st person perspective, you are imagining “me doing this” and you will later experience yourself doing it or something like it.
    - If you imagine doing something from a 3rd person perspective, you are imagining “seeing myself doing this” and you will later experience someone doing it or something like it.
    - If you imagine an owl in front of you, what you are doing is imagining "seeing an owl". You will subsequently see owls. Everyday people call this "synchronicity".
- The pattern will overlap with other patterns you are holding onto. This is why it does not immediately become your experience. It is immediately *true* but your other patterns fit it into a time framework.
- The more detached you are from sensory experience and the *felt-sense*, the more swiftly and completely the pattern becomes experience. If you had no time-pattern at all, it would be immediate.
- Note that *an emotion is a sensory aspect*. To hold onto an emotion is to trigger or retain all patterns which have that emotion as a part of them.

The Angle

- *Define and assert yourself* as the open space of awareness in which sensory experiences appear.

- Remembering that all imagining is in the 1st person and is the triggering of a memory-pattern which will come into experience - you should always imagine from your own perspective.
- Patterns are manifest immediately from the perspective of time. “It is true *now* that this happens *then*.”
- Ultimately you should aim to detach completely from the sensory experience round you (what seems to be going on) and from the *felt-sense* (which is a summary of the *facts-of-the-world* you have accumulated).
- The more detached you are, the more you can simply “just decide” on something (the partial imagining that is the “decision” will trigger the whole pattern via *auto-completion*).
- In the absence of complete detachment, allowing the decision pattern (which will typically just be the *feeling* of the decision) or an imagined situation (a sensory visualisation of the desired experience) to intensify before letting it go will prioritise it over other patterns.
- It is fine to re-decide or re-imagine a pattern *provided your decision does not contain any temporal-but-non-specific details of the path of manifestation*, even if just implied. Otherwise it will be essentially recreating your future pattern again.

[...]

You can directly experiment with this.

First I'm going to say: you are experiencing your entire world right here, now. All of it. You tend to thing of the big shining images, sounds and textures as it, and then emotions and feelings, but that's just the unpacked part of the whole thing, which is here too as a sensation. But it's obscured, like the sun hides the stars.

You use it all the time. It's everywhere, but you find it by going to that feeling roughly in the centre of your body. Very subtle. Go to it, with a question in mind, the answer comes from there. Your intuition comes from there. Your whole body experience actually arises from this. It's the entire patterning of the Imagination Room, you might say.

When something changes about your world or in your person, that's where the shift occurs.

> Q: I've just never really experienced a collection of all of my reality-shaping habits.

In truth it is always contextual in terms of what is clear, right? It is always responsive and unfolding. But everything seems to be in there if you go looking, vagueness comes into focus. I don't think you can *experience* all of your habits separately and all at once. That would be like trying to experience all colours separately but at once - you just get white. Does that make sense?

In the post I was mainly trying to highlight that you can't make changes (personally or in your world) if you are restricting the movement of this - e.g. the feeling that comes up associated with an intention and you resist it or push it or whatever.

> Q: What is actually a habit?

A very good question! I say, today: An experiential pattern, the whole pattern being triggered from part of it, just like with any memory pattern. Which is why the way to stop a habit is to disrupt the pattern by dissolving the emotional aspect of the trigger, or breaking the sequence (can do this via imagination, summoned from the felt-sense?). It's no different to, say, thinking of the start of a favourite song and it then continuing in your mind. Only this time the result is played out spontaneously in the main area of your imagination, as it were.

> Q: Is it an on-going intention?

In a way, it is right? But I think "intention" has become a difficult word since it gets used as something in mind that you're then going to "intend". Maybe we could say: An intention really is just a pattern of experience you've created, either a one-off (you create a temporal pattern which manifests something in the future) or something more general (you create a pattern which manifests in certain circumstances) or a "fact" (a static background pattern that filters everything else).

> Q: What I'm trying to figure out is, why do habits make it seem like we've forgotten how to intend? Does this mean that intending is also part of the pattern?

I think it means that people never knew how to change their experience anyway. Sensory experience is arising and as it unfolds they are imagining nothing useful. People simply don't realise how the work. They try to "do" things by summoning up muscle tension patterns, or ineffective verbal thoughts patterns, or actually focusing on the troublesome pattern more. Want to kill a habit? Activate that pattern and activate a neutral pattern (such as the experience of complete empty space) at the same time - or some other stronger pattern. If you generate a strong emotion then that can help. (The *Overwriting Yourself* process is about getting rid of residual perceptual patterns in this way.)

Intending is deliberately "deciding", but deciding is simply activating a part of a pattern and having it auto-complete. What makes out an "intending" from another memory pattern? It's: the temporal pattern. Activate a sensory event pattern and a temporal pattern at the same time, and you've effectively updated your "timeline" (whatever you want to call it) with that event. And so on.

So, this is always about summoning a memory pattern or two in order to strengthen them so that they shape your subsequent sensory experience. Mixing patterns provides context and organisational structure. We've already got some pretty deep formatting - such as temporal, spatial location, all sorts of other abstract frameworks, our own body pattern - we can leverage. And there's all those accumulated *facts-of-the-world* too. The infinity aspect can get out of hand pretty quickly, so I always treat something like the Infinite Grid concept as my baseline. Experience works on an "as if" basis, so whatever metaphors you adopt, your experience will seem to fall in line. Using this knowingly keeps things in hand - rather than going on meta-adventures via synchronicity. Choose your fictions wisely!

> Q: Can you rephrase the last bullet? I'm having a difficult time grasping that

On the *felt-sense*? To experiment, literally place your attention roughly in the centre of your body, perhaps nearer your lower abdomen. And wait quietly, to feel what is there.

The feeling is what you might call the "global sense" of your whole situation. It's much easier to do than to describe! Give it a go and get back to me if you don't have any luck.

> Q: No I meant ["It is fine to re-decide or re-imagine a pattern provided your decision does not contain any **temporal-but-non-specific details of the path of manifestation**, even if just implied. Otherwise it will be essentially recreating your future pattern again."]

Ah, right. The idea is that if you just think "I will see owls", without specifying any details, then "owls' is overlaid across time. If you keep thinking "I will see owls", or "owls are cool" and "I really like owls" that pattern doesn't get disrupted. However, if you thought "I will see an owl on Tuesday", and then start thinking

"no, owls on Wednesday" or "will I see owls on Tuesday?" then you are mangling what you've already laid out. You are revising your pattern.

> Q: I see, so consistency in your thoughts is preferable?

Yes. Passing thoughts are fine, let them rise and fall. With *intended* thoughts, though, you should stay consistent, because you are effectively rewriting yourself each time you do it, creating a muddle if you keep changing your mind!

The background felt-sense is (as I tell it) all the persistent *facts-of-the-world* you are holding onto. Obviously there are levels to this, patterns upon patterns. Something I've noticed is that even when there are stuck sensations elsewhere in the body, they are referred by this central sense. Which makes, um, sense really!

> Q: So that which arises is limited to that which you perceive as possible. Is that what alignment with the felt-sense means?

All experience arises from the felt-sense. If that *is* your world and you are navigating through it, then you are basically exploring the world as dissolved and summarised in your felts sense. You can do a little experiment. As you go about your day, exploring the world and exploring your thoughts, notice how you do it. Despite what you might assume, you actually seem to navigate by *feeling your way* along. In quiet moment, settle your attention in the centre of your body and explore the sensation. Ask it questions and see what you get. The entire state of your world is potentially available for exploration. If nothing else, it's free transformative therapy on tap! :-)

(Quick response, but this is "the" topic, although having a model of it is not entirely necessary for getting on in your world...)

> Q: I've begun to get more and more familiar with this sensation. I consider this to be the source of all of it, am I wrong in stating this?

This is how I view it. Everything is in there. It's an area that would benefit from some proper coverage! I've not really explored how best to describe it.

> Q: I'm calling them other sensations but perhaps "the sensation" is the amalgamation of all sensory experience.

It's all patterns, your entire state. When you go exploring through levels and such, that's where you are exploring. The perceptual sensations (images, sounds, textures) appear spontaneously as you unpack patterns-objects from there. For fun perhaps we could view it as our Global Lightbee which projects everything in our Imagination Room.

I'd love to hear your thoughts on this, especially how you feel we are perceiving ourselves at all? I view it currently as the Self created other (or perceived exterior) in order to have the necessary contrast to perceive itself. It depends on what you mean by "ourselves". If you mean the thoughts, bodily sensation, etc, we identify with, that's just a habitual pattern. Think: how do you work out which bits of experience are "you" and "other"? By spatial proximity, by whether there is a feeling within that spatial proximity, by the timeliness of response between you "asking" and "receiving" and the case of inner-outer distinction it's subtle things like whether "other people" seem to respond to them. These are arbitrary.

As soon as you experiment with synchronicity and intention, you realise that it's just all imagery arising within you - the undivided open aware space - and you are categorising different images-objects-patterns according to their intensity and location. When you come to the idea of the floor of the Imagination Room, or the Global Centre of the *felt-sense*, you then view *all* of this as just spontaneous imagery from an exploration of that.

> Q: I'm more curious how we're able to perceive period?

I think on the one hand it's impossible to answer (I offer no other hands, it turns out).

All we can say for certain is:

- We are a consciousness.
- Experiences arise within and of that consciousness.
- We cannot experience ourselves "doing" or "selecting", which implies that we "take on the shape" of experiences.

We can only think in terms of 3D sensory images, we use metaphors to extend that, but we can never truly *think-about* these things - such as what we "really" are, how did experience come to be formatted the way it is, and so on. Thinking about those things creates a self-patterning chase of one's tail that we can't get out of.

The reason for that is that we think experience and think about things using the process that that experiencing and thinking follows. As I said elsewhere: Even worse, the more you try to get a handle on the whole synchronicity thing itself, the more incoherent, confusing and "meta" they will become. It's like a dream trying to work out how "dreaming" really works behind the scenes, and just ending up with... *more dream*, only this time about the subject of "dreaming". - TG

Whatever you think, formats your experience. There is no "how it is", only what we assert. All we can do is choose a pattern which is stable but flexible, and use that as our base. Experience behaves "as if" there is a static wholeness that we are exploring. And it behaves "as if" we bring aspects of that wholeness into experience by "remembering" them. I think that's as far as we can go.

> Q: I feel that there is static wholeness, but how are we able to explore the wholeness as though it is separate and to form these wild patterns that vary and differ?

We let ourselves feel separate from experience by designating one part of it as "us" and hold onto it, letting the rest change. Even "being the background" is a subtle version of this, albeit the most flexible version there is, and the one I go with, because it effectively attaches identity to "the consciousness" rather than "the world".

TL;DR? Stop trying to work out how things supposedly are, instead just decide how you *want* them to be?

(From elsewhere, but relevant perhaps when it comes to asking what we can truly say about our experiences, what is permanent and fundamental, and what is changing and so cannot be. Maybe other Oneironauts might find it a useful exercise.)

Exploring Direct Experience

Here's how I have proceeded before, from empirical evidence:

- **It appears that am a conscious being of some sort. No matter what happens in terms of content, this persists. I seem to have no permanent structure. It is the one certainty that does not need interpretation.**
- During waking hours this conscious being it seems to have the experience of being-a-person.
- Within my perspective there appears both thoughts and perceptions as a seamless experience. I don't perceive either to be external to my being, however I notice they are of two levels in terms of behaviour or impact and I make a distinction between "private/inner" and "public/outer" as a result.
- I notice that I am not simply a passive experiencer (although through experimentation I notice I can just let things happen "by themselves"), I can also "intend-imagine" changes in my experience.
- Having noticed that this waking experience seems to be associated with a body, and seeing other bodies, I infer that there may be conscious beings associated with them, having a similar experience. (However, having noticed how my own activities can occur spontaneously and without direction on my part, I quietly note that I can never be certain that activity equals an experiencer.)
- I notice that I am the occasional recipient of information that is beyond the context of my present experience. Sometimes intuitions about the current situation, but at other times knowledge which implies that situation I have not yet encountered are in fact already created in the background and awaiting my experiencing. This and various other things remind or suggest to me that I am not in fact a person so much as having a person-experience - I am not of this world but I have allowed this world to arise in me (or something like that).
- Exploration of phenomena such as synchronicity reveal that the inner/outer distinction I use for convenience is not as solid as I usually assume. They suggest that usual assumptions about the unfolding of events, coherence of narrative, and our simplistic "world-sharing model" are probably not solid either. However, since phenomena such as synchronicity get "meta" very fast, with an affect akin to exploring your own memory-patterns, it is best not to involve oneself too deeply.
- **All experience I have seems to arise within and of and be made from the consciousness that I am.**

Now, from this we are left with what I think are unanswerable questions or meanderings one has while exploring the above:

- What am I really, really? I can only know what I'm not. I seem to be just impersonal consciousness.
- I experience being a person or a mind, but I am not one.
- This "world" I connect to - does it exist only in this consciousness?
- Am I connecting to something or am I imagining something? Perhaps I am taking turns at being each of the people in that world, only I cannot remember being one when I am being the other.
- The previous point might explain why sometimes events "bend" in my direction in unlikely ways and even at the expense of others. I am that world's God having a person-experience, however so is everyone else in turn (and being-a-person limits one's "powers").

- The world might be structured so that every person-experience is responsive in this way, because its "sharing model" is not as simple as "people in a room, choosing the consensus decor together".
- If I have an OBE or NDE or (to a lesser extent) a lucid dream or (to a maximum extent) when I die, am I disconnecting from that world and connecting to another? Or is it revealing that I have basically been having a custom dream all along? Or is it revealing that there is always a next moment to experience, at the same level, and this never ends?

Of greatest interest to me is what the "world-sharing model" is, if indeed this is something that can be pinned down without encountering the synchronicity mind-formatting problem (that the metaphor you adopt tends to filter your experience).

Are you and I both here at the same time, in the same place, in a straightforward manner?

Anyway, from there we end up with the Patterning of experience, the uses of metaphors such as the Infinite Grid to help us format ourselves better, and so on. Another version of that "patterns + eternalism" view which can be used for "as if" exploration:

The Hall of Records

Imagine that you are a conscious being exploring a Hall of Records for this world. You are connecting to a vast memory bank containing all the possible events, from all the possible perspectives, that might have happened in a world like this. Like navigating through an experiential library. Each moment is an immersive 3D sensory image.

And there may be any number of customers perusing the records. So this is not solipsism: Time being meaningless in such a structure, we might say that "eventually" all records will be looked-through, and so there is always consciousness experiencing the other perspectives in a scene.

At the same time, this allows for a complex world-sharing model where influence is permitted, because "influencing events" simply means navigating from one 3D sensory record to another, in alignment with one's intention. This process of navigation could be called *remembering*. Practically, this would involve summoning part of a record in consciousness and having it *auto-complete* by association. This would be called *recall*. You can observe something like this "patterned unfolding" occurring in your direct conscious experience right now.

[...]

So I think you're asking: if you intend something, and then later keep self-consciously acting to try and make it happen, will that work against you?

Generally, you do the intentional act (imaging here, water-pouring elsewhere) and, since *the world is literally updated at that moment* you just carry on with your life, knowing that the change has already been done. Since your body movement is as much a part of the world-pattern as everything else, you'll let that carry on as normal too. If you happen to feel the urge to go somewhere or say something, you let it happen; there's no purpose in trying to work out what to do. "Don't interfere", is the phrase to have in mind, because interference amounts to re-intending.

However, since your main intention was probably a much more strongly activated pattens than your little interference, you tend to find you result really tries to push through into experience, whenever an appropriate gap or context arises.

> Q: Quick question, what's a time-pattern?

It's the organising concept or pattern of "time", in the same way as "space" is an organising concept. The idea being that neither time nor space are existent "out there"; both are part of your "human experience formatting", in the same way as the senses are.

To expand - Just as you might pass your attention across *things* (spatial objects) in a pattern of "3D-space"; so you pass your attention across the *events* (temporal objects) in a pattern of "time". The patterns are defined and format experience, like the colour spectrum is defined and formats experience - they place structure upon and as content.

Unfortunately, the idea that a *spatial* scene exists and is defined even when we haven't fully viewed it, is ingrained in most people, whereas the idea that a *temporal* scene exists even though we haven't fully looked at it, is not. In both cases it's better to say that the *formatting* or *environment-context* is defined, but the *content* is not.

Just Decide.

Lie down on the floor, in the constructive rest position (feet flat, knees bent, head supported by books) or the recovery position (on your side, upper arm forward) and *let go to gravity*; just *play dead*. Let your thoughts and body alone, let them do what they will. Stay like this for 10 minutes. If you find yourself caught up in a thought of a body sensation, just let it go again.

After the 10 minutes, you are going to get up. *Without doing it.* Just lie there and "decide" to get up. Then wait. Leave your muscles alone. Wait until your body moves by itself. This may take a few sessions before you get a result, perhaps many, but at some point your body will just get up by itself. Once that happens, avoid interfering with your muscles and let your body go where it will, spontaneously and without your intervention.

This is how magick works. All you need to do is, *decide*. As Alan Chapman says, "the meaning of an act is what you decide it means". But you don't even need an act. You can just *decide* an outcome, a desired event, to *insert a new fact into your world,* without a ritual. Just decide what's going to happen. **Just *decide*.**

Decide to be totally relaxed. Decide to feel calm. Decide to win at the game. Decide to meet that person you've dreamed of. Decide to be rich. **Decide to triumph.**

Because in this subjective idealistic reality, where the dream is you, what else is there to do?

Note: When doing the part of the exercise where you get up, you may find it helpful to centre your attention on the area just behind your forehead. This keeps "you" away from your body, and any attempt to "make" it happen.

[...]

Hypnosis is pretty much 'decision and allowing, or acceptance of direction, without muscular action'. You are actually doing hypnosis on yourself all the time, but you accompany it with excess muscular tension, to feel that "you" are doing it.

I'll say this: That having an *experience* like the one I describe has more influence than any amount of thinking and philosophising or even accepting of a worldview. You can see it in people: Their body moves by itself, and suddenly causality doesn't work how they thought it did. It's suddenly easier to make the connection between how a person can change the world directly - it's "all you" and responsive.

The more you read around these things, as a person, the more you are able to deconstruct the assumptions you have been made. In my experience, all-or-nothing jumps to an alternative worldview just cannot be communicated to others. Now, that which is behind the person - Shiva! I see Him behind your eyes! - is always listening. Often you can talk to both at once, and one message and another message are received and acted upon in different ways. Sometimes experiences lead to the ability to conceive of things that one couldn't previously. That's why there needs to be doing as well as thinking, in a manner of speaking.

> Q: suppose I am committed to the idea that I accomplish things by going up against external resistance

If you are committed to that idea, then enjoy the struggle. **I'd prefer to be committed to the idea that it can all be effortless**, and that **all I need do is make the choice that what I want to happen will happen, and it will.**

Decision precedes experience. You don't *need* to deconstruct by contemplation.

> Q: And knowledge/understanding precedes decision.

It is not required. Only in the sense of it occurring to you that it is possible for 'such and such' to happen, that you would do the deciding, I suppose.

To detail it out: You don't need to understand the details in order to get what you want, you just need to know what you want. That sorter of 'knowledge' doesn't seem very challenging, or much of a hurdle. Needing to understand in detail how the reality 'works' or its nature would be greater hurdle. This is optional though; all you need to do is have demonstrated to you that decision -> result, and then accept this.

[...]

> Q: I disagree. You can get started in the way you describe, but getting started will lead you toward the path of contemplation.

The knowledge required isn't very great though, is it? **Just "this is a dream" is sufficient.** Just decide to switch your perspective to containing space, and you're pretty much there. To *stand as awareness*. **When you become the context rather than the content, you're free.**

> Q: No. I have a bag of peanuts compared to your one peanut.

But... they're in a bag, all constrained and trapped. It's probably not even a transparent bag.

> Q: You can't leverage something that's been dissolved.

Dissolving just means something stops being mandatory. You can use any route or pattern you want. Or not. However, just recognising the existence of a pattern means you can skip it; you can leverage that pattern through choice, or not use it. Recognition of the arbitrariness of a pattern - that it is not actually a *shape of the world* - is sufficient. It's about giving yourself *choices*. You don't actually need to dissolve everything to nothing to give yourself that power.

> Q: Nonsense. Karma means intent, and Dream Yoga leads to mastery of intent instead of its absence.

Karma means accidental creation of non-transitory patterns through intentions/actions that aren't 'transparent'. Leave no trace.

[...]

Well, the main "decide" is to "decide to be the awareness in which this experience arises". And it works, instantly. **Then it's all yours.**

Also, why not decide the small stuff too? It's not like there's any effort involve. You just "get it" for free. And if things don't go your way, delete them and replace them. Another way of saying this is: *inserting new facts into your world.*

It's not a waste of effort and diversion, but it may be true there's opportunity cost - if you focus purely on those things. But **there's no reason you can't have it all.** Human experiences are fun! **And fun is what life's about.** Because even if you have "greater ambitions", **you can still have an excellent day-to-day existence**, as you travel that path.

> >Q: Yea, but every decision has opportunity cost.

Why is there an opportunity cost? The point is you can have those things without using emotional energy/investment. If you ask for these things *and* the triumphant, you'll get a sequence of experience that provides you with both.

In my experience thought there are other forces at work. Your larger identity has already made some decisions on "your behalf" (because it is you). There pre-date your birth, most likely.

I'd say that, while you are having a this-world experience, you are bound to certain human dependencies. Such as documents, and money, and physical health. I've done several 'accidental experiments' in this regard, and although I can control the 'pain' involved, that doesn't make the source problem disappear. Although there's some approach to that - the re-absorbing/dissolving does have a two-way effect. This doesn't *have* to be a painful process.

> > Q: This world is an outcome, an outflow, and not really a driver. Once the mind changes, the world changes.

This is true.

> >Q: World, I know you, I see you... you got nothing. Do your worst. I will relax and have fun. Is this honest if I am also wishing for a million dollar mansion and a crew of butlers, chefs, and personal attendants? If I am all that I say I am, I need nothing, and I need to prove it to myself. This is a steep and severe commitment. Normal people cannot hope to even touch this.

Has it ever occurred you that, if this is just a dream, then the point of it is to have cool experiences? And not much else? And that each person's idea of a cool experience will be different. So, yours is to experience stripping the world of all its content, laying it bare ("You take the red pill"). Another person thinks, I want the yachts and famous girls and excitement ("I know this steak doesn't exist. I know that when I put it in my mouth, the Matrix is telling my brain that it is juicy and delicious."). As in, it's just arbitrary.

[...]

> > Q: [And it works, instantly.] No, it doesn't. You're a living proof that it doesn't work. Realizing that you aren't a body or even a human and that you're actually a mind is important. But it's not like you just decide it and instantly it's all over. This thing doesn't work like that. It's not that simple. And you know it.

It *is* that simple. But you're right, the final results don't come "instantly" - I mis-spoke - just like the standing up in the example, or the acquisition of riches.

For instance, my "overwrite-with-empty-space" process for relaxation and undoing yourself, is direct and works well. However, you *can* just lie down and *decide* (declare!) that it is going to happen, and the same effect will gradually take hold. But, *you must know what you're asking for.* The extra bit is, how immediate you want

the results. Now, what does involve breaking down "resistances", but these can be approached in the same way. And gradually, your experience of getting results will become more and more direct. Do this exercise daily, and with the decision to dissolve all barriers, and it'll happen.

> Q: Right. This is much more important than asking. You have to conceive of your desired state correctly, and firmly.

Yes, otherwise it's a decision without, um, a decision! I don't think you need all this clarity, all that. You can wrestle with this, but really if you just commit to the decision, to the *insertion of a new fact into the world*, that is sufficient. One of the decisions you should make, of course, is that you live in a dream-like reality, to allow your desires to appear through more direct means than you would otherwise allow.

> Q: This isn't the only exercise that works. I am giving up humanity as my exercise. I do it daily. And it works.

All good. The content, purpose, direction of the exercise can be anything. The important thing is to do it; the important thing is to "declare a direction for your experience", in effect.

> Q: But there is so much temptation to stop doing what you're doing and begin doing some exercise which looks snazzy.

That's why I strip the exercise down to, essentially... nothing at all. There's not much to get attached to here. It shouldn't derail anyone from what they're doing, only add momentum to it. That's why I've got rid of all the "magick" stuff completely. It's just straight forward "you-as-the-environment", changing your shape, selecting the direction.

I strip it down to its essentials, because that's the effective part. All the other exercises are built on this. Have this experience, then you'll get everything else. (In fact, get this, and you don't *need* anything else, potentially - although it'll take a little longer than strictly required.)

[...]

There are no tradeoffs in a dream necessarily. You can ask to see a "square circle" and you'll get one. You can give people this experience by hypnosis too.

Meditation: In and of itself it doesn't give you anything except an opportunity for your body/mind to unwind itself. If you get "enlightened", it's an accidental side effect, when your mind gets tired and gives up, and you open to the larger space. It's *process*. You can select the process leading to your result, if you like. One day, some physicists hope to describe the whole universe with an equation. One day, neuroscientists hope to describe how consciousness emerged from the brain. Similarly, one day we hope to have direct control over our experience/limitations. Until we've *done* that, though, it's still a matter of philosophy and hope, under investigation. We may have an *idea* of how this should work, but until it does... My approach seems to work pretty directly, within the current habits of the person. Working on those habits, too, is key. But one has build up so many "mental objects" that *do* have persistence, that in actuality you can't just "zero it all out" instantly. There seems to be a time component.

[...]

The universe is a concept; that is what you are bound to, implicitly.

Super-Simplified Models of Reality

One of the outcomes of Oneirosophy is that, since all experience is effectively dreamlike and is you, we recognise that models of reality are pretty arbitrary and pattern-based. However, we do usually feel we need of some model or metaphor in order to contemplate and direct our experience. And indeed, it is discovered that a fully absorbed model itself behaves as an "active metaphor" which *shapes* our experience.

I was briefly musing about what the most basic *but useable* version of my idea of reality would be, ending up with the text below. What are your own "super-simple" or "rule-of-thumb" models?

TG's Super-Simplified Reality Model™

Think of yourself as an *open holographic conscious space*.

- All patterns are present *right now* and active *right now*, dissolved into this space.
- Nothing is hidden or elsewhere; such patterns are simply not activated at an intensity level that is noticeable.
- Meanwhile, there is no time or space, other than as a formatting pattern.
- All content is 'imagination'.

To bring something into experience, we *imagine or recall that pattern*. We do this simply by intending to do so. Everything else is then completely automatic.

- The first step is to decide to enter a state of detachment and absolute allowing. This is to cease the re-activation of current patterns and allow them to yield or subside.
- Optionally, one may also spend time imagining an open empty space, in order to clear oneself of residual experience.
- From then on, one does *intending-imagining* to trigger experiences you want to have.
- Our identification should be with the open space, rather than with any particular piece of content that appears within it.

[...]

> A1: I like that you put a trademark this time. [Our identification should be with the open space, rather than with any particular piece of content that appears within it.]; I think this is the part that's hardest for most people. I want to highlight that so that maybe we can make it easier for everyone on a whole. The reason it's so tricky, I believe, is the language we use in daily convention is built around the notion that you are a physical body and the world is a physical place. If you're a particularly socially active person, you'll be very hard pressed to maintain the awareness that you are, in fact, the whole experience, and not the body of Joe Somebody talking to Susy Cuteface. You're experiencing that, sure, but because language is going to likely encourage you to use the words "I" referring to Joe Somebody, you will easily slip back into the notion that Joe Somebody is the all encompassing identity of who you are. It happens so quickly and is usually not noticed until you take a moment to reflect on who you actually are. So a word of advice, if you are socially active or a regular member of society - whatever that means - take some time in isolation to work on this stuff. However much you've got, the more the better. If you can't go more than a few seconds being aware that you are everything (and nothing) and not

> just "a guy" or "a gal," then trying to figure that out while you're in the midst of the play of human society is going to drive you nuts. TG has a pretty good releasing exercise I'll try to find, otherwise "regular" meditation works. Which by the way, is not the act of "concentrating really hard to make thoughts go away." That's someting else, still useful, but meditation should be thought of as a broadening of focus. Feel free to ask questions in your meditation as long as they are relevant to you. "Who am I?" Is the question that ultimately you're trying to answer when you meditate.

Haha, well Nefandi and I were joking about my particular turn-of-phrase, so I thought I'd make it official. ;-)

Your observations on language and socialising are spot on. The hurdle they produce is that the language implies and triggers a being-a-person pattern (felt boundary and location) but it also directs and narrows your attentional focus. A useful way around this is to adopt the idea of "letting the world come to you". Rather than focusing in on things with one sense or another - e.g. "concentrating on what someone is saying" - sit back a little and have perception arise by itself. This will feel different to your usual mode: rather than (say) grasping for seeing, and therefore seeing *images*, you will tend to perceive *objects and meaning*, without effort. This is great for eyesight improvement.

. © 2015 TriumphantGeorge. All rights reserved.

Daily Releasing Exercise

• Twice a day, 10 minutes, lie down in the constructive rest position.

• Completely let go to gravity. Give up totally, play dead.

• If your body moves or thoughts come up, let them be. Just let them release without interference.

• If you find your attention becomes focused on something, the same: just let go of your attention. Give up, again.

• At the end of the session (don't worry about exact timing), decide to get up, but don't make any movement. Wait until your body moves by itself. This won't happen for a while, but during one session, it will.

• In general, resist the urge to interfere with your body and mind, to push it along. Settle back and let it run at its own pace.

That's the chap! It's basically the passive version of *Overwriting Yourself* plus the experience of *Just Decide*. It's simple and effective. It feels good and it involves nothing more than not-interfering, so no excuses!

[...]

> [**Nefandi**: It's hard to say this is some kind of final version of what I use, but here it goes:
>
> 1. Possibilities are limitless. All conceivable and a vast array of currently inconceivable states of experiencing are possible to attain and maintain indefinitely.
> 2. Manifestation = current intent - prior intent.
> 3. Intent (or will) is always effective, even if there are no currently visible effects.

4. Intent is structured conceptually. Conceptuality is neither evil nor something one could rid oneself of, but if one fails to understand the nature of conceptuality, there is a possible downfall there.

5. Everything matters because everything is effective, provided it's still supported by your will in some way. That tiny mundane memory from 30 years ago? It's still affecting who you are today and it even affects the quality of your meditation. If you don't like this, you have to transform your memories, or their meanings. If you leave things at status quo, expect their effects to last indefinitely. Thus, even stupid and mundane events from 10 lives back can be affecting you today. Good news: nothing is lost. Bad news: nothing is lost. Good news: everything can be transformed. Bad news: things don't necessarily transform of themselves, so passive waiting is often a waste of time if transformation is what you want.

And then I always reflect on my value ladder:

1. Wisdom.
2. Power.
3. Compassion.
4. Imagination.

In that order of importance.]

That's a nice summary, especially the note about memory.

Miscellaneous Posts

/r/Oneirosophy

Intersubjectivity

> “Intersubjectivity is a key term used in philosophy, psychology, sociology, and anthropology to conceptualize the psychological relation between people. It is usually used in contrast to solipsistic individual experience, emphasizing our inherently social being.”

In our own dreams, the whole dream is 'us' and our intentions manifest fairly directly (although there are cases where strange things do happen); we are 'sole creator'. The experience is of being a 'dream space' but identifying with a 'dream character' who acts as the perspective centre. In waking life, although our personal experience is identical upon examination ('awareness space' with content arising in it and identifying with a perspective character), the world tends to be less obviously flexible and we assume that there are other 'people' sharing the world with us - who themselves are experiencing an 'awareness space' with content arising within it.

The only *observable* difference between waking and dreaming is really the sluggishness of the environment in response to our intentions, the rest is *imagined*. But I still find the 'multiple perspectives' thing quite tricky to get a handle on. Sure, I know that I am not a person, I'm a 'space with an imagined dream character', and in that sense on equal footing with the other people I encounter (avatars?), but I've yet to come up with a really satisfactory way of thinking about this.

Any ideas?

[...]

That's why I included "although there are cases where strange things do happen". Sometimes you encounter other characters who seem stubbornly like 'other people' rather than part of your dream, for instance.

One possibility is that, although in general your dreams are 'seeded from scratch' - they are fresh and borne in a new 'space' - this is not always the case. Sometimes you are joining as a perspective in a pre-existing environment. Like connecting to an online gaming experience. This raises the extra question: If we are a 'space', when we dream are we connecting to existing 'mind-realms' and sometimes seeding them, and why are we apparently by default connected to this particular 'waking' one?

(Robert Munroe, the OOBE guy, in later books starts connecting to other worlds - he thinks - to the extent where he revisits the same place and 'person perspective' later, and finds that their lives have moved on as if they were still playing out in his absence; the worlds are persistent and independent, apparently.)

> > Q: But intent is a powerful thing. If you think you are connecting, it will manifest just that. So in effect, you might as well be connecting if you really believe you are. So there is that too.

There is that. That's the thing: expectation is pretty powerful, and hard to disentangle. And expectations often seem "obvious".

> > Q: To me expectations are the most devious things ever. I often discover expectations when I didn't think I had any, at the least opportune moment usually. I certainly have hidden, subconscious or maybe even unconscious expectations that I haven't unearthed yet. I am pretty sure of that. They're sneaky as hell and they hide very well in the background of my mind where I can't find them easily.

They act as filters, sometimes dangerously so. Sometimes *it just won't occur to you to do something important* because of your expectation that it isn't possible, or it simply isn't included in your worldview. For instance, I am really interested in the 'making decisions' process, because I think I actually didn't really make decisions for the first chunk of my life; rather, I experienced sequences of thoughts. I wasn't *intending* to change course. This didn't matter, until 'environmental events' derailed one particular project because I didn't keep on track, and I didn't really know how to maintain it.

> Q: It's important to remember that relaxation is intentional too.

Yes, and this brings up another line of thought. I followed the Alexander Technique for a while, and many teachers talk about "sending messages" to yourself to release your neck, and so on. Martial artists such as Peter Ralston similarly (although much more knowledgeably; that book is a guided exploration of what it is to be a person). Basically by "send messages" they mean *intend*, but most people don't know how to intend. All they know is how to move their muscles, directly and clumsily. Hence all those tense-up-and-release relaxation approaches. Not needed: just lie down and intend to be completely relaxed until you unravel bit by bit and get there. You are just moving yourself from a universe where there is tension, to one where there isn't.

> [**Nefandi**: Intent is very hard to understand because we tend to have misconceptions about it.
>
> For example, we tend to speak of intentions as if they were separate little bits. In reality intent is one uninterrupted flow. Intent has no starting point in space or time, no ending point, no transition point, etc. All the changes in intent are imaginary and somewhat arbitrary, but as imagination they're also real. Intent is also multi-level sometimes (maybe often).
>
> So for example I do a contemplation like this. I relax my arm on the table. Then I raise my arm. And I lower it. As I do this, I ask myself, when did I intend to raise it? My real answer is, "as I intend ongoingly so it is raised ongoingly." But my question demands some kind of singular atomic burst of decision, but that's not what happens. So my question almost wants me to say that I intended to raise my arm at 15 hours 15 seconds, and starting from 15.5 seconds to 20 seconds my arm was raised. This separates intent from action. This also atomizes, chunks intent into a single burst at 15 hours 15 seconds. But is that how I really intend?? NOOOO!!!! I don't do this!!! I can stop my arm at any point during raising it!! Intent is **ever-ongoing**!! It is ever-smooth! There is no burst! Intent doesn't precede anything. Intent is concomitant with action. In fact, intent is identical to action. Real intent is indistinct from the dynamics of experience. It isn't something that precedes or follows or exists on par but somehow separately from experience.
>
> Also, there is no obvious point where I decide to raise my arm. Raising the arm looks like a clear distinction. First relaxed, now raising. Seems like there is a difference. But there is no point in time when I can say the arm is no longer resting and now it's only raising. There is some ambiguous interval where it's maybe both resting and raising or it's unclear? But the transition is smooth. There is no sudden jump. So no matter how suddenly intent appears to change, its real character as I see it is smooth and there is no single point when we can say now it stopped doing this and started that.
>
> We don't know how to intend because we intend all the time, but we cover up the function of intent with our bogus ideas about how intent works.
>
> Intent is always: perfect, effortless, spontaneous, smooth, beginningless, endless, flowing.

> And now I want to mention the multi-levelness of intent. This one is simple.
>
> For example, I decide to play a game of chess. As I sit at the chess board, that intent is ongoing. I also intend to move individual chess pieces one at a time. In truth this is all one smooth flowing intent. But conceptually we can say it has two levels: 1st I maintain ongoing commitment to a game of chess, and then 2nd, in the **context** of that commitment I move the chess pieces according to the rules to which I have committed myself to. All this is concomitant and ultimately it's impossible to strictly separate the intent to play chess from the "individual" intentions behind each move. However, it helps to talk about intending to play chess, and then to also separately talk about the individual chess moves. That's just one example of how intent can be multi-layered.]

I'm with you and not. To some extent here you are *inferring* intention when what is really happening is the continuation of an existing motion as a *complex momentum* towards an intended goal.

I'd simplify this by saying: intent cannot be experiences for experiences are results; intent is injecting a goal into experience. It can be ongoing, or a flash, or whatever. It can be an instance of "free won't" - just halting a direction experience is moving in - or setting a new target, immediate ("raise my arm"), short term ("off to the shops to buy milk"), or long term ("become King of the Monkeys"). It's like making a wave in water while *being the water*: rippling yourself. You can then adjust the ripple's propagation by rippling in the opposite direction, or adding more detail, or whatever. You might feel a sense of resistance when you change the direction, but other than that it's an effortless process with control of details unnecessary – wu-wei?

We're probably just arguing over language here. Momentum = ongoing influence = intention. I would have been better saying *changing my intention* or *changing my goal* to be clearer. And yes, experiences always flow towards your intention. (But one does or can infer one's intentions from the experiences that arise, because you can't actually experience the act of intending itself. That's how you discover you have hidden assumptions and so on.)

I guess I was trying to get away from the idea that *the ongoing influence of intention* would require some sort of continual maintenance or effort; it doesn't. Resistance and effort is only encountered when you are conflicted.

Am I a bit clearer there? It's always "all you" so you're never uncontrolled or running wild and all over the place, in that way. However, it *should* be effortless if all is well.

I revise my statement, and say "flows-with"! By 'goal' or 'intent' I don't mean a conceptualisation of it, I mean an absorbing or becoming of it. It's not an aim, although that's how we might talk of it afterwards.

Let's explore with perhaps more important examples: magick. A classic New Thought way is to "adopt the feeling associated with having attained your goal" and then wait for thoughts, actions and events and environmental changes to occur until that goal is your present experience. How does your notion of 'intent' fit in with that? As I see it, I could view this as having 'changed myself' into the person with that outcome and now it's just unfolding. Would 'intent' be better phrased as a sort of 'mental posture'? Because it's not an action itself, but language forces us to frame it as such.

> [**Nefandi**: Intent is goal-aware but it isn't the goal itself because intent can also abort goals and redefine them, so it can't be goals. Intent is deeper, more fundamental than goal setting. *"A classic New Thought way is to "adopt the feeling associated with having attained your goal" and then wait for*

> *thoughts, actions and events and environmental changes to occur until that goal is your present experience. How does your notion of 'intent' fit in with that?"*; In my way of thinking what you suggest is confused. It can work, but it puts intent into a snarled multi-leveled state. So first you begin expecting something. Then from the context of that expectation you evaluate your experiences for signs of goodness. This will bias your experience toward the desired result, but just from how it was formulated, you're giving it plenty of chances not to work also. When intent is genuine it's instant. There is no waiting around. If you're waiting, something else is going on. Intent is not physical action exclusively. Intent is mental action of any kind. Or you can think of it as mental orchestration of action instead of action. But orchestration happens concomitantly with action.]

Hmm, interesting. So, taking my example, I would say that I only need to 'intend' adopting the feeling-state corresponding to my desire (the intention and the adopting are the same thing really, I just 'adopt the feeling state' really). Then I leave it alone, and the world lines up. (In a dream, the change might happen instantaneously, but in waking life, it doesn't.)

At any point I can 'intend' again and have my experiences flow differently. The core idea here is in this "feeling" - it's the "global sense' of yourself and the world. *What would it feel like if this were your experience?* It is the feeling of "your shape" at this moment. In this view, "intention" isn't action at all as such, but it is "with" action, it is the decision of what your action means. The action itself doesn't matter. Summoning a feeling is probably the simplest action you can take, non-physically and non-mentally.

Hmm, I am not being as clear as I'd like.

> [**Nefandi**: *"Hmm, interesting. So, taking my example, I would say that I only need to 'intend' adopting the feeling-state corresponding to my desire (the intention and the adopting are the same thing really, I just 'adopt the feeling state' really). Then I leave it alone, and the world lines up. (In a dream, the change might happen instantaneously, but in waking life, it doesn't.)"*; Yea, because look at the big pancakes of intent here. During dreaming, you let go of objectivity to a large extent and you no longer adjust your expectations toward what you might think is a neutral standard of some sort (this is what objectivity is). In your dream world you think there is just you, so there is no neutral standard that you **commit** to. "Commit" is an important word, keep it in mind. Since you have no commitment to constantly adjust your experience toward a neutral standard, it flows instantly or very quickly with your intent toward your goal.
>
> When you are awake, things are more complicated. When you're awake you then have an unshakeable and abiding commitment toward some seemingly external neutral standard. You no longer think it's just you. You think whatever changes happen now have to be witnessed and approved by, and be participated in by multiple observer-participants in addition to you. This is your commitment to convention. So whatever other commitments and intentions you try to generate during magick, they happen in the context of that prior commitment to convention. Guess what? That context is not magick-friendly. The whole point of that context is to make it look like experience isn't owned by you! If it's a neutral ground, you can bring some changes to it, but no huge change can be done by you without some cooperation of others. You can move your body around by yourself, and that's about it. Anything more fancy requires cooperation. In other words, the whole point of that commitment to convention is precisely to prevent magick.

> So if you try to use magick as an ordinary human with a commitment to convention, which most humans maintain unshakably, then it's likely to either fail or work super-feebly.
>
> What you really want to do is something crazy. You want to abandon your commitment to convention. No more neutral ground. You absorb all of this waking phenomenal reality into yourself as your dream. It's no longer a democracy. Now it's just you, just like in a dream. Now things are not fair anymore. Now you've made yourself a tyrant. Now you can use your magickal intent. And now without your commitment to humanity (convention) you can make things happen as quickly as in a dream. However, because all this is done in a kind of inhuman state, it would be scary as fuck, because as you do this, you wouldn't be doing this as a normal human. When you abandon convention you're basically at least temporarily leaving your "I am a human" card on the table. You're not acting with human limitations, but then you're kind of like a beast or a deity. You're not human. For most people this is too freaky to even contemplate, never mind actually experience.]

I agree on the commitment thing. It's the, erm, magic ingredient. I used to use the phrase "fully intend", but there's no decent way to say it. Essentially, it just means *step forward without a care for doubt and have it happen*. Still, this loops us back to the intersubjectivity thing. Now, I *know* I can have other people behave differently, and for recent events to be effectively 'deleted' so I can have another go, and so on. And I know I am not a "person".

I am all people? Am am none, I am the people, the environment, the space in which the environment residues, and "that" in which the space appears. What are you? What happens when "we" both reshape ourselves (i.e. the universe)?

> **[Nefandi:** Let's say you perform a powerful spell where you take control of the world as your dream and you kill me. Poof. From your POV I am gone. But from my POV nothing happened to me. So I can't see the you that knows I am gone in my world anymore. So our subjectivities diverge. In my world I get a copy of you that never performed the spell. And in your world you get the world without me in it.]

Yes, **this**. Taking this further, by making it less extreme, if you and I "intend" different things, do our subjectivities diverge so that we both have the experience we desire?

And the "you" that I am left with, what is that? It's a "you" without anybody looking through that "viewport"?

Yeah, this is the core of what I am getting at with the "intersubjectivity" topic. It also helps tackle some of the moral issues that players in the game might come up with. My previous approach to this was to think of ourselves (myself, yourself, whoeverself) as "extended beings" across all possibilities.

So, if we think of a (rather multi-dimensional) grid in which all possible moments, all possible experiences, are laid out, each from my 'viewport perspective' - well, *I* am extended across all of them, but I am only *looking* into one of the locations at a time. The history or 'timeline' of myself is the path I travel across that grid, moment by moment, choice by choice.

I tried exploring this idea through the perspective of time travel a while back - taking this more extreme example of 'changing the moment' to try and bring out the issues and details - but actually I think it just confused the issue, because of course people wanted to discuss actual time travel mechanisms a la sci-fi.

I think 'time' gets to the heart of things, because what we often implicitly mean by magick and manipulation is *a discontinuity in our experience*. A jump from one moment to another moment that would not normally follow from it. Conventional time is surely imaginary?

[...]

> A: Let me put it this way. Goals don't set themselves by themselves. That's why intent isn't the same thing as a goal.

Yes, that's fair enough. Goals are a conceptualisation or representation of a desire. It has no 'motive force', just as simply owning a photograph of a nice fast car doesn't create any momentum towards you actually owning one. With this stuff, there's always a hurdle of developing a common language with which to discuss it. So let's have "goal = conceptualisation or image".

So, can we say that "intention" is the *meaning* that is attached to a particular act, be that mental, physical, or something else? Or even more broadly, "intention" is the meaning we attach to a particular *change*. This means that intention itself can't be experienced alone; it is not a thing, it is almost an *applied interpretation, live*. (We're returning a little to Alan Chapman's idea here, that it doesn't matter what you do as your magickal act, it's what you decide it means that counts.)

I don't really mean 'assigning' as a label attachment - that returns us to conceptualisation - so much as doing-with-purpose. It's simultaneous. The language is introducing a duality here where there is none. Another way I see this is a 'releasing into a direction'. When we walk forwards, we release ourselves in that direction, as an analogy.

I believe intention is *the* fundamental thing. It's a muddied word. Are we better to just jump in and say it's *free will* and we have free will because we *are* the fabric of experience, and so can shape ourselves however we choose?

Excuse this extended quote, but it's from a decent recent book which tries to capture some of what we've been discussing, without me having to type too much (Bernardo: see this as promotional!):

> “So, in the context of all these metaphors, what is it that makes mind move?
>
> Notice that the answer to this question cannot be a phenomenon of experience, since experience is already mind in motion! Whatever the primary cause of the movement of mind is, it cannot itself be a movement of mind. Thus, we cannot find the primary cause in physics, biology, psychology, or any area of knowledge. The difficulty here is the same one behind the impossibility to describe the medium of mind itself: since all knowledge is a movement of the medium of mind, that which sets mind in motion cannot be known directly. But we can gain intuition about it indirectly, by observing its most immediate effects in experience and then trying to infer their invisible source.

> Our ordinary lives entail unfathomably complex chains of cause and effect: one thing leading to another, which in turn leads to another ...and another, along the outlines of a blooming, unfolding pattern that we call the laws of nature. But at the very root of the chain of causality there seems to be something ineffable, tantalizingly close to experience, yet just beyond it: freewill.
>
> Whenever you make a decision, like choosing to close your hand into a fist, you have a strong sense that you were free to make the choice. But usually that sense comes only after the choice is made –immediately after – in the form of the heartfelt certainty that you could have made a different choice. The direct experience of freewill, however, remains ambiguous: before you make the choice it is not there; and then the very next experience seems to be already that of having made the choice. The experience of making the choice seems lost in a kind of vanishing in-between limbo, too elusive and slippery to catch at work. It is as though freewill were outside time, only its effects insinuating themselves into time.
>
> Yet, freewill can be so tantalizingly close to experience – perhaps arbitrarily close – that many people are convinced that they feel the actual choice being made. Personally, despite having paid careful attention, I have never managed to satisfactorily 'catch' this elusive experience in an unambiguous manner. I can't prove it is not there, but I hope to have evoked enough doubt about it that you are open to the possibility that choice itself is outside experience. We only really experience the prelude and the immediate aftermath of choice, never the making of a choice.
>
> Though I am aware that this is the trickiest element of my entire argument – resting, as it does, more on introspection than logic –I contend that freewill proper is the primary cause of all movements of mind; the freewill of the one subject of all existence. Freewill can never be experienced directly: it is the driving force behind all experience and, thus, never an experience itself. But we can infer its existence from the retroactive sense of free choice that we have immediately after making a decision. This sense of free choice is, so to speak, the 'echo' of the primary cause reverberating within our psychic structures."

- From *Why Materialism is Baloney* - Bernardo Kastrup

I would tend to just use "intention" for all of the above, with context adjusting the meaning. The reason is that it's the most vague version, which doesn't necessarily imply "doing" or "gripping", which to me gives the wrong sense. All of them just mean "directing the content our experience" in some implicit way, surely.

> Q: Whenever you make a decision, like choosing to close your hand into a fist...

To be fair, here I think he's just trying to point out that you can't *experience* the doing, the "first cause", so people retrospectively tell themselves a story to fill the gap. There *are* moments of redirection and interference, however, when we change course. Calling them "choices" or "decisions", those are just best-effort words to fill in an event that is ungraspable as an experience.

I agree there is no real "stopping-and-doing" but it's difficult to discuss this without isolating examples, even though that isolation is false. So I'm giving him a pass on this, for now. ;-)

> **Nefandi:** I'll give it one more try. *Every* moment is a moment of choosing. They're not some rare and special moments that happen only once in a while. Now take all the moments and erase boundaries between them. Now you got what I call "intent" or "volition."

I know what you're getting at, that's why I said there's no "stopping-and-doing". Although conceptually this is fine, I find I don't really *experience* each moment as a moment of choosing, when I examine it. I think that I *could* if I were more attentive and present, but I don't. I seem to drift in and out of that over time.

> > Q: But I do! :) I experience it! :)

I think this is part of the point of this sub, and of Dream Yoga. You have to examine your experience in order to change it. You *can* have that experience if you hold on to yourself. Really entering into a Dream Yoga view, though, surely you would have the opposite sensation? Just a thought. Funnily enough, arm experiments like that were something I did do when following that Peter Ralston book (*Zen Body-Being*), which is all about exploring how you work. There's a 'pre-feeling', then a movement, that is ongoing. But the key is *my attention is on it*. Meanwhile, my foot is tapping up and down and I haven't noticed, and I'm frowning with one eye slightly closed and I haven't noticed.

> > Q: Think like this: if you think there is a unique and specific moment of choice, then what is this followed by? A choiceless moment? And then what? Another choiceless moment? At what point will your ability to make choices come back?

You can make choices at any time - i.e. interfere with what's happening. The ability never leaves, *provided you are present to the moment*. But you need not ever interfere. Zen Buddhism is much concerned with the arising of 'natural action' as a response to the environment, for instance, without 'doing' or 'choosing'. You are not required to manually control yourself each moment. You can do so at any time, but equally you can step back and let things happen. In fact, you probably live most of your life this way without noticing. Then there's is Jiddu Krishnamurti's way of describing 'choiceness awareness':

> > “Krishnamurti held that outside of strictly practical, technical matters, the presence and action of choice indicates confusion and subtle bias: an individual who perceives a given situation in an unbiased manner, without distortion, and therefore with complete awareness, will immediately, naturally, act according to this awareness – the action will be the manifestation and result of this awareness, rather than the result of choice. Such action (and quality of mind) is inherently without conflict.”

- *Choiceless Awareness*, Wikipedia

[...]

> > Q: The only way you can't be present is to choose not to be. In other words, you end up always winning here, no matter what.

Attention is a filter, not a torch-light. But, it can get stuck and localised, defaulted. A key practice is to dissolve that boundary, expand back out again, I have found.

> Q: When you don't interfere you are still choosing moment by moment to maintain a space where things can happen in a disowned context.

This isn't an *ongoing choice* though. Once you've 'stood back', you don't need to keep re-choosing it, maintaining that position, once you have practiced this for a while. At first you do need to maintain a space because your default attention might be highly localised; but this will loosen by itself eventually, quicker with encouragement.

> Q: Think about the state of the muscle in your tongue. When you move your tongue during speaking, do you interfere with it? And when you stop moving the tongue you stop the interference? This makes it sound like your tongue has its own mind and its own desires that you interfere with.

You don't interfere in such detail, or should I say "choose/direct". The choices you make tend to be broader than that, and everything falls in line. Just as when you stand up from sitting, your body coordinates itself, you don't have to manage all the muscular movements individually - or at all.

By interfere, though, I'm not suggesting a separate 'interferer' and an 'interfered with', although you can artificially experience one.

>Q: Nonsense. Sorry. There is no independent reality. Because there is no independent reality, there is no free-of-bias anything.

There is the 'relaxed position' of things, however. What you get if you stop forcing your experience. This isn't about there being a 'real underlying reality' or whatever - just about 'mind' (or whatever you want to call it) being left to settle. Note though, a relaxed mind isn't necessarily an *unmoving, unchanging* mind - just as a pool of water will still have its original ripples once we stop disturbing it.

> Q: Besides, isn't a torch-light a filter of sorts too?

Attention is a filter in the sense of being a masking process. The key difference in the default state implied:

- With the torch-light metaphor, the implication is that the default state is nothing - no content - and we have to actively, with effort, shine our attention on things to gain information.
- With the filter/mask metaphor, the default would be wide-open awareness, and what we're doing is contracting that to have our attention limited. Furthermore, with a mask your attention needn't be a simple 'circle of light', it can be distributed at different intensities across experience - for instance, people have a tendency for their attention to jump to the objects in a room, and be unaware of the spaces between.

> Q: All choices are ongoing

Okay, this is our way out. I would agree that choices are ongoing, just not that they are necessarily *continually, actively made or re-made*. If that make sense. Meanwhile, we could rephrase relaxation as a release of attachment, if that's better for you.

The filter metaphor of course also allows for a *focusing* and *active constraint*. It's "the win" because it gives you the benefits of the torch-light metaphor (narrow attention) with the benefits of open awareness and of *structured attention over space*. (It also corresponds nicely with some research on 'attentional styles' and perception etc.)

> >Q: Wide open awareness means awareness that is open to possibilities. One such possibility is absolute nothingness.

There are two senses in which attention can be wide open. One is in the sense of *right now*, taking everything in as it is in 3D-space and more - including the underlying background awareness for everything. Then there is 'what is possible', also opened up. So, yes.

> > Q: Filtering suggests that you aren't meddling with anything...

I see where you're coming from. It's the 'creative aspect'. The filter *doesn't* imply that what's outside the filter is safe from influence and manipulation. It is a filter of *attention* which *overlays* awareness. Awareness itself is unbounded.

There is another thread to this of course: The creative aspect of attention. In a lucid dream, I open a door, and without fail there is something beyond it...

> > Q: Then it's not so bad, but I'd wager you'd be dominated by the presently apparent phenomena in this mode.

Not if you have direct experience of the open unbounded space. The idea of the filter is that if you release it, you are unrestricted in that way. You would experience the phenomena *in context* - the context of a dream-space.

> > Q: Filter metaphor suggests that objects of attention exist before the act of attention attends to them. That's how materialists think.

Not really (just). Berkeley's idealism, for instance, doesn't suggest that experiences don't exist *in some way* separate from an *individual* attending to them. He phrases it as everything being witnessed by "the mind of God", by which we really mean that there is an unbounded consciousness, of which each of us is a part, or a witness via a perspective.

> > Q: I don't conceive of myself as filtering something...

If all possibilities exist, and you are only experiencing one, then you are filtering, not creating. But this is really just how one thinks of it. We've moved along here somewhat though, from what I initially meant.

Two sorts of filtering, then:

- ***Filtering of the 3D Present Moment Experience:*** Here I am, right now, experiencing this moment. I don't feel that "I am a vast open space", I feel more enclosed than that, more constrained. If I let go, however, I find that my "hold" on the experience loosens and opens out. If I keep doing this (over a long time) my 'attentional profile' gradually expands and opens. Alternatively, I can force this by actually stretching out evenly into space. This removes the distinction between "me" and "my

environment", letting me *feel* the dreamlike nature directly. This is something I have deliberately experimented with.

- ***The Filtering Of Possibilities:*** Enfolded within every moment and every space is 'all possible moments'. Like a configuration space with all possible combinations; we are at one location in the space at any one time - we have filtered down all possibilities into a single current experience. The current experience is the 'unfolded' one. This is more a way of conceptualising possibility.

The latter might be better viewed as a creative act, an implicit or explicit one. The first one was really what I was referring to. I assume already that "anything is possible".

> Q: I'm not a part. I am the whole thing! And so are you.

Yes, it just *seems* we are a part, because we have a perspective. Just because I am not constantly experiencing all my memories all the time, for instance, doesn't mean they are not enfolded in me. (Not a great analogy.)

You see the need, though, for things to be 'enfolded' somehow? Because we both need creative access to 'the whole thing'? All time, all space, all at once? Extra thought: *we are not actually 'located'.*

Creative access = opening the filter = dropping inhibitions / restrictions.

It's always *access to yourself*, of course.

[...]

Additional Question: What's your problem with advaita/non-duality? Now, there are some authors I think are pretty rubbish (Tony Parsons, for instance), and many of them don't get how free will can be incorporated, even though to me that just drops out of it naturally. However, it does seem to me that most are striving for a similar thing at root - i.e. to directly *experience* that there is no separation between you and your environment, you are "all this" and there is no underlying solidity beyond that.

Meanwhile, most idealists are happy discussing it philosophically, while never **actually *living* it.**

> Q: I dislike Advaita teachers because they promote choicelessness and absence of free will.

I agree that will is paramount. In fact, one of my concerns about subjective idealism as commonly treated is that it doesn't adopt this fully, due to still holding onto the notion of 'objects' and encountering rather than being or making. *Will forms perception*, it is inseparable from awareness, because the Will is about changing awareness.

I think it's the "Neo-Advaita" people that are particularly bad (that one can't say anything, basically!). We should probably separate Advaita from Non-duality; there are people in the latter camp who have a better grasp of things.

> Q: This isn't what I want at all.

If you and the environment are not separated, 'merged', then it's surely saying that it's all under your control - there's just *experience under Will* (or "ongoing choice" as we phrased it).

Better to say: you don't merge, you just *recognise* that there was no separation. Of course, it's up to us whether we want to experience 'being a body with magical powers' or 'being this whole room and changing it how we

want'. I want that cup of coffee over there to change into a glass of water? Well, I *am* that cup of coffee, so no problem. The feeling love thing, so not what I mean. I mean something more like, bringing/recognising your surroundings are under your influence.

The *experience* can feel like merging when it happens, but in fact it is just realisation. Delocalised experiences can be a mix of exhilarating and terrifying. Which is not unexpected: it feels like a threat of death, and in a sense it is.

It's a big hurdle for this stuff, which is why most people are happier with servitors and sigils and so on for magick - an obvious intermediary that you are "sending out in to the world". People are resistant to OOBE-type events for the same reason. Separation anxiety?? :-)

The technique I started off with was the 'rope technique', of which there are a few variations. But basically, you just relax and try to 'feel a rope in your hands' as you pull yourself out. It takes a lot of courage to push through the initial vibrations, and other potential unpleasantness. (If you haven't played with this in a while, it's worth a punt, just to see what happens now...)

The whole area of resistance is a curious one. For instance, if we lose our keys we are happy to look over at a nearby table and see them there, even though there's no way they could have got there. However, the other way round - we look at the table *and then they appear in front of us* - we're less happy about. Even if we *think* it might be cool. So we filter out those possibilities, those "reality shifts". And this is before we've even begun *deliberately willing* changes.

I take all stories with a pinch of salt, but people do seem to get quite thrown by fairly simple changes because it raises other questions: in that case, *if my world changes, do I take my friends along with me, or do I now have different friends*? This adds an extra level of caution to intentional acts.

From the person's perspective, not having a philosophical framework to refer to, and mostly never having even thought about this before, they get pretty spooked.

Some deliberate efforts at world-changing, like the 'Tesseract Magick' experiments (pinch of salt but interesting), make a definite point about bringing people along. Better maybe to say *that aspect* of a person?

Some of the ones in /r/glitch_in_the_matrix are apparently absence seizures. Or... is that just what the experience seems like because you didn't take anyone else with you when you 'jumped'? (If you look for an explanation, surely you will find one, such is the creative nature of attention.)

> Q: Even having a solid philosophical framework is only a minor advantage, I think.

It might make the difference between "hey, cool!" and losing it. But as we've covered previously, there's a difference between having thought about something and *knowing and feeling* its truth. People dabble with magick, having read all the stuff, and it's all fun and joy until demons actually do turn up!

> Q: "Better maybe to say that aspect of a person?" Better for what purpose? Goodness of this or that is relative to some aim, right?

My aim in saying "aspect" was because it fitted in nicely with my concept of "extended persons". As you say, we often strive for clarity, but if I just say "extended person" then the nature of that extension - multiple copies, multifaceted, holographic - can stay nicely ambiguous while still conveying the notion of being more

than just "this version, here", and "aspect" sits well within that. No metaphor I've played with *really* fits. Which is to be expected, in a world of infinite possibilities... ;-)

This area is why I was questioning your notion (as I read it at the time) of choices being continually *actively made*, although I like "ongoing choices" or "continually active choices" as an alternative. Because this version of me, typing at my Mac, is the "viewport version" as I see it, the one I am experiencing in my "space-that-is-me", and from this perspective all the other parts of my "extended being" as seen by other people are philosophical zombies. They are unfolding in automatic fashion, choices unfolding in tune with their trajectory and character, but not being redirected.

Effectively the "extension" is infinite, but it's simpler to visualise. For instance, I think of all possible moments as being a grid of 'viewports', with each square in the grid being a 'picture' of the view into that moment. Of course, that grid is infinite, and the adjacent squares aren't spatially located so there's no 'adjacent', and they aren't squares, and the 'picture' is actually an entire world from a particular perspective. It's just about giving myself something handy to refer to, while understanding that it is just a partial representation of something that, essentially, cannot be represented by its nature.

> Q: Thinking in terms of continuums helps me to avoid thinking about people as if they were substances.

This is key, and that's where the 'viewport' idea comes in originally (as a first stab at this). You see, from your own perspective you aren't here at all, you're transparent, you are just 'tuned into' this perspective on this environment. You are only a person from others' perspective.

Playing with this, what "you" *really* are is "that which looks through the grid" or the opportunities it represents. I filter my attention so that I am only experiencing one particular possibility, one grid square viewport at a time. What "I" am to you is a picture, an image, which may or may not have a consciousness looking through into this part of the grid.

Of course, as an "extended person" all possibilities are playing out in character, it's just that I am not necessarily attending to that part. If I am not attending, it's *like* I am a philosophical zombie, that part of me.

> Q: Typical, conventional people will see my vivified body as a person. They won't see my subjectivity the way I experience it.

They don't perceive your subjectivity, just a picture of Nefandi, moving about, *implying* a subjectivity. Whether you are 'really there' or not is not detectable from their point of view. There is also the issue that the particular 'you' they are experiencing as a companion in their world is something they themselves select, implicitly or explicitly.

>Q: Every POV is ultimately possible. That's the secret.

Yes, that's right, that's the thrust of the 'grid/viewport' metaphor effectively. On deeper analysis, the pzombie problem actually disappears because of this, but it's a handy way of imagining at the earlier level.

This is not a bad point to make: since you only actually experience one 'selected reality' at a time, the rest is basically imaginary thinking-about, just a way to keep the possibilities alive within you.

Thing is, once you make a jump, you can't get back, because the history of the jump is now part of this moment. You can perhaps go to a *new* moment similar to the previous, but that moment-prior is inaccessible *with the memory intact*, sort of by definition. If we delete aspects of the world (Lathe of Heaven), fixing it won't take it back *really*, the best you can hope is to make it as indistinguishable as possible. But then, *how much control of the details is really possible?*

As you traverse 'the grid' I think you would want to retain the memory of your path, wouldn't you? Of course, you could never know for sure that you had done so, because the memory is also part of the world associated with your the grid/viewport position. I can't think of a reason not to want to retain an 'internal' trail of the jumps/changes made.

That's the old story about God though, isn't it? God gets bored and so deliberately forgets himself to make it all exciting. How far can I push it? Further, more adventurous, more apparently risky. Finally, what would you dream? You'd dream *this* dream, of powerlessness. (The Alan Watts angle on it.)

[...]

What's wrong with our (apparent) world anyway?

If there's something wrong with it, that really means there's something wrong with *me*. Or rather, something wrong with *you*, depending on your perspective...

I vote *you*. Because the world seems alright to *me*.

Subjective decoherence will see me right, of course. In fact it already has, naturally.

If you hang around long enough and are successful, subjective idealism will turn into a religion! Albeit with only One follower. ;-)

Well, materialism, religion and consumerism have become the assumed structures of our time I suppose. They're all under pressure though? Property ownership will become a vaguer notion, but not without a massive copyright fight. (Once digital copying -> 3D printing -> generalised object instantiation.) It's the rebalancing of money-power that's the real worry. "I drink your milkshake!"

Perhaps you can help it along?

[...]

My favourite New Thought friend, Neville Goddard, has a good "pruning" exercise which I really should remember to do more often: Each night, replay the day you've just had and amend it to your liking. Change all the errors to what should have happened; delete those disagreements. Reset the situation for the new tomorrow. Go into a shop, ask for something. They don't have it? Go take a browse, delete that conversation and reimagine it. Try again. *Change your feeling of the world into one where it is there.* If you do this wrong though, through being inattentive or casual, it can go *really* wrong pretty quick.

It's much easier to do forward work though. For instance, have tomorrow's exam contain the two questions you actually studied for. That's more everyday magick of course, but its apparent retroactive component can be a challenge for some.

> **Nefandi**: *"Go into a shop, ask for something. They don't have it? Go take a browse, delete that conversation and reimagine it. Try again. Change your feeling of the world into one where it is there. If*

> *you do this wrong though, through being inattentive or casual, it can go really wrong pretty quick."*; This is how I break locks on the doors to my apartment building, lol. What I do is assume the door can't be locked and pull it. I hate having to open the front door, basically. It's a hassle. So I just pull it. Sometimes the door is locked and when I pull it nothing happens. But I don't give up. I have a habit of pulling the door while assuming it can't be locked. Then what happens is I find the lock is broken, or the door is slightly ajar, or the lock mechanism failed to engage, etc. I even surprised the fuck out of my wife a number of times by magically opening the front door that wifey was sure was locked. haha.

I like the locks thing, nice. What I'd like: deliberate fast travel. (Glitch 'n' shifts sites are good for inspiration I think.) There's also that whole siddhis teleportation thing for one day. A little ambitious for now, though. The revision exercise is a good one, and it helps practice what I think is vital: generating the *feeling* that summarises something as being true/real. His *Power of Awareness* book is worth a read; I should add that to the list. His lectures tend to emphasise his Bible-as-instruction-manual-to-reality mindset, but his books less so. And it's free.

A small, repeatable change of some sort. Things like the "prune the day" exercise are a good place to start though, just for general use, because of the apparent indirectness, but the measurable effects, in terms of unlikely reversals.

Meant to add: I think things like this happen all the time, we just don't notice it, because of an apparent rule of *self-consistency*. That is, memories and the moment seem to fall in line.

Perhaps the world does indeed get recreated each moment, in line with our direction, amendments as required/desired...

[...]

Hmm, I'll need to think about that a little; seems interesting. *"Our expectations are internal to our being, they're not something we can look at the way we look at chairs";* No, but the world we experience does reflect our internal expectations and biases - we live ourselves through our 'external' happenings?

True Will & Subjective Reality

True Will Defined

In the magickal writings of Aleister Crowley and Thelema, the concept of True Will - appears - fundamental:

> “The ultimate goal of a Thelemite would be to understand and perform their True Will. The concept postulates that each individual has a unique and incommensurable inherent nature (which is identical to their “destiny”) that determines their proper course in life, that is the mode of action that unites their purest personal will with the postulated course that preexists for them in the universe. The idea is that to the extent that one is pure in their will, one is carried along effortlessly by the momentum of the universe like an expert sailor allowing the current to carry the ship along its intended course with minimal effort. In Crowley’s ethical treatise *Duty*, he identifies True Will with the Nature of the individual.”

Could we call this "what we really, *really* want" vs what we think we want, perhaps? In his book *Head Off Stress* architect, author and mystic Douglas Harding put it:

> “In fact we can distinguish three areas of intention or will: (i) what you think you want, (ii) what you really want and (iii) all the rest, what you're up against, what the Universe wants. Now if it should turn out that this third and immensely larger area is what you really, really, want, and you not only contain the world but intend the world, that you want it all - (i), (ii) and (iii) - to be just as it is, why then you would be happy indeed. If you were wholeheartedly to choose the whole lot, all your stress would be laid to rest.”

Unrestricted Freedom? Going With The Flow?

If waking life is an unbounded dream in the same sense as a lucid dream is, then our ability to create change in line with our ego is unrestricted. However, if there is some deeper structure to us - that what we might *like* to do isn't necessarily what we *should* do in a more fundamental sense - there may be limits, due to a pre-existing momentum. We might in anger want to tear up the world, say, but that desire is actually an indication of our sense of separation (not truly feeling at one with the rest of this 'dream') and so is not our True Will; we will not be successful in having strong results in that direction, results that persisted. Similarly we would only be able to resist certain actions and paths for so long, before we were "made" to follow them or do them. The universe would play nice with us initially, but eventually get impatient and nasty - - -

An analogy might be that we are whirlpools in the river who can by force push ourselves in any direction, but it's always going to be easier to follow the rivers path. Or waves in the ocean born with a momentum in a certain direction, with our power only being to tinker with the details of the path and the amount of suffering along that path. A main concern would be one of *listening* and paying attention as well as *directly manipulating*, to try and pick up on this 'momentum' - because a *with-momentum* route would be the most efficient and most likely route to succeed.

True Will: True in Experience?

In your experiments with magick and subjective reality, have you found any problems getting what you "want" vs what you "should do", or a sense of a direction that things want to go in? Or do you see this as a completely flexible reality that the observer can potentially direct in any way they want? Have you come up against, or benefited by recognising, such a thing as 'True Will'? Or is it just a morality-based, human-centred concept with semi-religious origins?

[...]

I guess you could look at the "angelic" path as a request with the flow, and the "demonic" path as a *forcing*. And it does highlight the problem that, if you try to work out by *surface thinking* what you want and how to get it, then it's not possible to anticipate the subtleties. Only the larger universe can take that into account. So angelic=grounded/wide view, demonic=ego/localised?

How do you think of "external deities"? If we're talking subjective reality then "everything is mind", supposedly, however some things are perceivable within our 'phenomenal space' and others are not. External deities tend not to be (although this isn't hard-line). Hmm. And what does "bits of yourself" mean in subjective reality?

> Q: im not really sure how i perceive these beings because although i am a subjective idealist, im not certain on solipsism or which degree in which to apply it. My experience with working with spirits is that they are higher dimensional beings in the literal sense, or as personifications of base energies in the deeper universe, hence why people have different experiences and interpretations of them. Of course maybe internal vs external is a duality altogether and even if you say everything is internal you still imply the existence of the opposite of external like up versus down. So i would say they are both external deities and internal aspects of our deep inner minds simultaneously.

Simultaneous, yes. My stab: We can follow subjective idealism without solipsism if we recognise that what "we" identify with as a person is a "dream character" and that is of no greater or lesser status than the other "dream characters" we encounter. In this sense, everyone is a part of our larger selves (the whole world). Then, spirits can be seen *both* as external beings *and* as aspects of ourselves - as can everything/everybody else.

> Q: I think paying attention is key in order to learn one's intentions.

That's what I was getting at with the "listening" idea and of a "momentum". If this is "all you", then maybe the whole thing is your True Will. Although you might try and fight against it (that momentum) out of ignorance if you aren't paying attention and don't recognise it. (So that would be about finding and eliminating *resistance* then, I suppose.)

It's not an easy thing to formulate really. Essentially, we are talking about our Nature.

There are things you want and things you don't want. There are things you don't realise you want or don't want, because you are not sufficiently aware of your true identity. As you become mindful of your thoughts, your body and the environment and its ground (of everything) then you *know*. The universe (the content) always moves in (or attempts to move in) the direction of this fuller knowledge, whether you yourself are aware of the knowledge or not.

Which is why releasing blockages, etc, is part of the process, in addition to any magickal/intention techniques. You can always have whatever you *choose*, but do you really *want* it?

> Q: This universe of limitations is our True Will, but when we rid ourselves of the universe as it is known, that too will be our True Will! Now, if you say it like that, there is no chance of getting it wrong.

There's a whole debate on what 'True Will' means in Thelema, because 'will' can be thought of in different ways, but the conclusion is probably 'True Nature', which keeps it away from individual acts of will.

>Q: "which keeps it away from individual acts of will." Which is both sad, and imo, not Thelemic anyway.

It's an attempt to separate the vague notion of "free will" (that you can do anything you want, including go against your own desires) with your God-like Will. But then, if you act against your desires, that's still your God-like Will surely! I'm undecided on the best way to think/talk about it. Maybe it's just because two worldviews are being mixed together.

>Q: I tell you what I feel when I interact with you. I feel like lots of times you keep me down, you keep me ignorant. But first I have to knock four times.

Really? It's not intentional. Usually I'm just 'feeling out' the best way to write things that I know non-verbally. I let this stuff slide for a while, so I'm kind of rediscovering some aspects as I go, and converting it from how I used to describe them, and realising new stuff along the way. Also, I find that I'm often not clear initially what you mean because you think of things in quite different terms from me, until I get the "a-ha" moment: *that* corresponds to *this*, okay.

For instance, the "enfolded/unfolded" stuff, and use of the word "universe", it just takes a few spins round to get us talking about the same thing, and then we make progress and things speed along.

> Q: Duh. :) Godlike will is not limited in any way.

Yeah, but you see what I'm getting at? Of course, *everything we experience* is because we *create* it, however we can deliberately will for things from ignorance, because we don't know our true selves well enough (beyond simply intellectually knowing it). Just because we are God, doesn't mean we are completely *conscious* of ourselves, due to limited attention. We can Will from the *perspective* of God, or Will from the *perspective* of an individual. That's why there's a point to doing exercises for awareness and so on, so that your perspective becomes more and more God, less individual, and so your intentional meddling becomes closer to "God's Will" rather than "ego/individual's Will".

>Q: Is it possible that in an effort to take my own assumptions as your starting point, you actually downgrade my view? As in, you think I hold assumptions which it turns out, I do not?

Hmm, perhaps. But I think it's more that it takes a while to understand what you're getting at, in my own terms. I could just write a screed in my own terminology I suppose.

> Q: Yes! But remember with that stuff, it turns out later that you understand that super-order is not possible ...

Well, there *was* a super-order, then a super-super-super... until infinite granularity.

>Q: But you were spoon feeding me assuming I am an idiot.

No, it's just how dialogue works. I talk about "implicate/explicate" as my basic explanation, we get on the same page, then it's like "wouldn't there be a super-order or not", well yes-but-no in the limit. Limitless potential, yes, but it matters that it's *folded inside the current experience*, and you only get that if you go through the steps (otherwise you have a need for an external 'observer' to keep everything existing, all that). Really I am just 'replaying' how I went through it myself, I suppose, prompted by the discussion. If was writing a post or essay, then that's different, because I'd think the whole explanation through first.

> Q (Nefandi): You assumed I was average, that's why.

Hardly. You seem to have a great handle on this stuff, and coming from another direction, so I get a new way of seeing it I wouldn't have thought up myself. You are also much more direct/ambitious with it than I would think to be, which is great. Pushes it along. If I've come across as condescending or something, I really apologise! I don't see this as *explaining*, I see it as *exploring*.

> Q: So we can make mistakes, but it's our sacred right to make mistakes.

Yep.

> Q: Only if you say "I am God" will you be right.

Agreed. It's like "you are the dream" vs the "dream figure" or even "all the dream figures" or even "all the things in the dream".

> Q: Only when you do it. I do better than you. I go faster and I am more direct. As a result I don't waste time and I tend to end up with amazing results.

Well, good for you then! ;-) Although from my perspective you jump to conclusions - or rather, attractive viewpoints - without building towards them. If we don't do the steps, then it can become more an act of faith.

That's why we need to do some exercises/experiments. In truth, "waking life = lucid dreaming" is a hypothesis that needs testing. That's why I wrote the *True Will* post: what are people's *actual* experiences, separate from what I *want* it to be like?

> Q: Precisely. Why build? If someone is lost, they can ask a question.

That's easier in a one-on-one context, rather than over comment threads. Having said that, we approached real-time so it was probably less of an issue!

> Q: In your True Will post you were suggesting that the universe offers a pushback of some sort... suffocating fatalism...

Yeah, that post was a prompt. Regardless of what I think, what do people actually experience? And how does that correspond to their progress? In the post I included three links to different interpretations of 'True Will',

to keep it broad. I didn't want to defend a position, I wanted people to tell me if *they* experience pushback, and what *they* attribute it to if they do. (Be that the 'universe', bits of 'themselves' that they haven't integrated, lack of confidence, misidentification.)

Yeah, I have what I think is how it all works. But we *don't* generally have complete freedom, because we are fragmented. That we *can* requires some work, some exercising. You'd agree, surely? Bold confidence and expectation can work wonders, but I still ain't teleporting about the place, y'know?

> Q: Listening is meddlesome. And manipulation is effortless.

Listening is a creative act (whether it is perceive something apparently persistent or not), but if the intention in listening is to hear what your 'larger self' has to say - by which I mean, the bits you've not yet expanded to include - then that's what you get, right? Until we're actually fully expanded, and directly experience ourselves as everything on a constant basis (rather than just 'know' it) there is still going to be the sense of an apparent 'other' to our 'self'. Dunno about you, but I am not constantly identified as the "the background awareness" quite yet...

> Q: Then why was there so much leading material?

Ya gotta frame it. I present the idea, the implied challenges, which *is* one of restriction, or at least one of *optimal path*. And really, *I don't know* if we are restricted or not. I have had some experiences where 'this' was the thing to do; I was told.

> Q: I wouldn't say "fragmented." In my lucid dreams I feel the world as just as external as I feel this world here. But I can still manipulate it freely.

That is a good point. But this is about *knowing*. When you truly *know* something, rather than think it, I find that I *feel* that truth. In fact, at the point of lucidity (assuming I didn't enter directly), that is the sensation that changes. And when I get those 'Dream Yoga' moments out and about, it's the same: the *nature of the experience* changes somehow.

'Feeling' isn't perhaps the best word, because I don't mean a bodily feeling or an emotion - it's a *felt-sense* or *felt-knowing*. It's the difference between *definitely this is transparent like a dream* to just seeing it that way mentally. That's what the expansion-type exercises are about; reaching out to that. (The 'looking inward' thing gives you the same flavour though, at least as a starter.)

> Q: Why did you frame it with so much fatalism?

It's not actually fatalism, it's presented (from sources) as a 'higher path', and an optimistic thing to strive for: *alignment* and effortlessness. But there is a negative aspect to it, if you just want a wide-open dream, if there is a pre-existing direction to things, which is what is implied.

> Q: Leaving suggestions only as suggestions I am supremely honest with my experience. I can't report a suggestion to be something other than a suggestion and remain honest. To report a suggestion to be something other than just a suggestion is a speculative act.

Yes. This is the essence of reflective experience, acknowledging the transparency.

> Q: We aren't restricted by anything substantial or external.

No, not substantial or external, there is no evidence for that. However, the restriction doesn't take the form of an underlying substance, if it exists, it takes the form of *not being able to simply adjust your experience to match your intention*. And for whatever reason, people report that you can't.

> Q: Felt-sense or felt-knowing... I agree.

I think this *felt-sense* in combination with knowing 'where to look' is fundamental to the endeavour. The idea of a *felt-sense/knowing* is pretty alien to most people, although some related work has been done in psychology that almost gets there by Eugene Gendlin, which has a philosophy based on 'implied steps' and unfolding.

When people hit 'realisation', is it *transforming* or is it *discovering*? The effortlessness is that of following the path revealed once blockages are cleared, not just an 'avoidance of discomfort' path.

> Q: From my POV, if you discover something, but it changes nothing about your experiencing and it doesn't introduce new capabilities into your life, then you didn't discover anything, or you discovered something in name only.

I'd say you *discover* more about your true self, which is *transforming* because your subsequent thoughts, actions, experiences and so on will now be informed by that expanded identity.

> Q: So what I am saying is, you can do anything, but it tends to have implications and consequences. If you're flipping here and there, it implies a lack of commitment.

Commitment is important, it's true. Maintaining parallel perspectives is probably not very meaningful other than a fun experiment to try.

> Q: ... and be visible to others.

What others?? :-)

Stanley Sobottka: A Course in Consciousness

This short dialogue provides a nice quick summary of how to get from "here" to "there" - a sort of "reality loosener" for times when all this stuff seems a bit too solid.The full course is quite interesting, a well put together survey of all the different aspects of science, metaphysics, and non-duality. I recommend it. It covers everything, even if you do not agree with its conclusions yourself, it will give your reference points for all the issues. Valuable material, even if it doesn't quite embrace the "subjective idealism + magick" aim of this subreddit:

> [When we realize that "we" have no control, there is a sense of freedom and energy because control is bondage even if we think "we" are the ones in control. This freedom brings with it the awareness of a power that is mysterious and profound, the power of Consciousness (God). Ironically, if "we" try to use that power, it disappears. This is a twist on the saying, "use it or lose it". Instead, it becomes, "if you try to use it, you will lose it". If "we" toy with the power of God, "we" will get burned by disappointment and disillusion, but when we realize that "we" have no control, the power of God, even though subtle, becomes awesomely apparent.]
>
> > Q: I would love to see a discussion of this here. My intuition suspects that the apparent polarity of control vs no control is itself a misunderstanding of something fundamental that underlies both understandings. But I don't know enough about it myself

The short version from me, to have control *is/requires* a release of control. **We *release ourselves into a direction*, rather than push ourselves into a direction.** That we feel that effort is required is a misunderstanding. For instance, we tense up our muscles in order to move, to 'feel ourselves doing it', but actually the tensing up gets in the way of our movement!

The Arm-Wrestling Exercise

Get a pal, challenge him (or her!) to an arm wrestle. Now, you're going to try two methods:

- The first time, put lots of effort into it. Really and try to win that competition! Use all your power, all your muscle!
- The second time - don't. Once in position, simply *decide* that you are going to win, and then leave your arm, your muscles, completely alone. Direct your attention elsewhere (into the space around you, onto the place you want to end up, the space behind your forehead - just keep out of your arm), and simply *wait until you've won*.

This illustrates that the attempt to control actually gets in the way of getting what you want, in this case. **Make the decision, let the path unfold by itself.**

Rick Archer interviews Rupert Spira

I found this to be an interesting conversation over at *Buddha at the Gas Pump* (a series of podcasts and conversations on states of consciousness) between Rick Archer and Rupert Spira about direct experiencing of the nature of self and reality, full of hints and good guidance for directing your own investigation into 'how things are right now'.

Archer continually drifts into conceptual or metaphysical areas, and Spira keeps bringing him back to what is being directly experienced right now, trying to make him actually see the situation rather than just talk about it. It's a fascinating illustration of how hard it can be to communicate this understanding, to get people to *sense-directly* rather than *think-about*.

I think this tendency to *think-about* is actually a distraction technique used by the skeptical mind, similar to what /u/cosmicprankster420 mentions here:

> [[*"The depths of the skeptical mind."* By **cosmicprankster420:**
>
> I thought i would share this experience while it's still fresh in my head because i am still baffled by the oddness of it. I was having a dream that i was walking around my neighborhood, and i realized i don't remember how i got here. I thought to myself, is this is a dream? It feels pretty real right now. So i decided to see if i could levitate and sure enough i could. I levitated a good 20-50 feet or so up into a tree and decided to stay up there. On a nearby branch in like a birds nest or something there was a black flask nearby. Curious in this state i decided to see if this liquor would give me a buzz. But just before i began to drink this voice out of nowhere came into my head and was like "dont drink out of that it might be poison, you cant be totally sure whether or not we are awake right now". And i'm like REALLY MIND? ARE YOU FUCKING KIDDING ME? I just levitated 20 feet up into a tree and you are still doubtful as to whether or not this is a dream.
>
> But i have had other occurrences like this as well, like if im pretty sure im in a lucid dream and i want to strip off my clothes, sometimes ill get this sense of "this might not be a dream, you don't want to get arrested". But there was still some legitimate doubt as i didn't do any levitating or nothing before hand, it was just a strong feeling that i was in a dream. But after levitating and having that voice go in, it really made me realize the lengths the skeptical mind will go to try to cling on to a materialist worldview. Maybe it has to do with the human part that wants to retain its survival, and maybe that has to do with that fear of dissolving boundaries and the comfort of consensus. This experience also shedded light on why materialists can take hard psychedelics and still remain materialists afterwards, the skeptical mind can always find excuses because skepticism can destroy any idea in ones mind because it is a kind of weapon, but the problem is that it can disprove truths as well as falsehoods if applied too liberally.
>
> anyway, that's all i have to say for now.]]

"This experience also shedded light on why materialists can take hard psychedelics and still remain materialists afterwards, the skeptical mind can always find excuses because skepticism can destroy any idea in ones mind because it is a kind of weapon, but the problem is that it can disprove truths as well as falsehoods if applied too liberally."; One of the major problems is that people *literally and directly experience their viewpoints as true*.

The concepts and beliefs you hold actively shape your experiences, because they "snap to" the subtle structures of your/the mind, which then further embeds those viewpoints in a feedback loop.

If you believe materialism (or just assume it, unwittingly - belief is not a choice usually) then you'll experience that as your truth. Things that don't fit in with it either won't be noticed, or will be explained away, or quickly forgotten. Only aspects which fit in with your established concepts seem to be clear and in focus.

On the upside, once you are introduced to new ideas and entertain them a little bit, those ideas will infect your experience and you *will* have confirmation of them. However, any doubt at all will revert you back to your previous, more established worldview - in much the way you describe. "Hey, I'm levitating! But, y'know, better watch out I don't get arrested for being too noisy in this quiet neighbourhood."

Our natural instinct seems to be to fight against having our attention settle down to our true nature.

Overcoming this - or ceasing resisting this tendency to distraction - is needed if you are to truly settle and perceive the dream-like aspects of waking life and become free of the conceptual frameworks, the memory traces and forms that arbitrarily shape or *in-form* your moment by moment world in an ongoing loop.

His most important point as I see it is that letting go of thought and body isn't what it's about, it's *letting go of controlling your attention* that makes the difference. Since most people don't realise they are controlling their attention (and that attention, freed, will automatically do the appropriate thing without intervention) simply noticing this can mean a step change for their progress.

[...]

There's something you should try: Make sure your attention/focus/presence isn't centred on your head/neck area. That's where tension and resistance and fight-flight tends to kick in, plus the upper chest. Instead, try to start with a pretty open,wide attention, lightly centred on your abdomen. Then when you get a "reactive kick" it won't have quite so strong an effect. Another thing that can happen is that we keep "checking" or at least slightly holding on to ourselves. Working towards an attitude of full commitment/abandonment is the way forward. Of course, all easier said than done, because it's a wee bit scary. :-)

> Q: I'll have to work on that. Moving my presence anywhere but in my head is pretty difficult.

Yeah, you can't *do* it. Rather than *move* it, maybe it's better to say *expand* it - to reach down further into your body. You'll be tempted initially to try and do this muscularly somehow but a bit of practice and you're good. Sorry, hard to describe!

Well, the universe moves all at once - it's sneaky like that.

> Q: I have begun doing a chakra prime and then grounding and aura charge before proceeding. The reason why is because I drained myself to the point of depression around October last year. I am trying to make sure that I am always filled with external energy. The chakra priming is done by expanding awareness and then absorbing energy and then pressurizing all the extra energy into a chakra. I do that twice per chakra because that tends to allow me greater sensitivity of my chakras. Then I sit for however long I feel I need and meditate until I start feeling a disconnect from my body and my focus can be at its greatest.

If it works for you, sounds good. I didn't really spend much time exploring that side. Perhaps just lack of dedication. :-) Although I have experimented with localised body areas (different areas of the "brain area", etc)

not really anything more formal. But also it felt like "effort" and, knowing I was already operating from a tense background, I figured I'd try and get to the most open, relaxed starting point I could. I began doing a 2 x 10 minute daily releasing exercise (lie down, let go completely and absolutely, let mind and body and attention move as they want) and then mixing that with something more active. The final idea being that, if I hit a base state, then intention would naturally call upon the appropriate approach; the routes of "manifestation" would be more flexible, as it were. I feel that in the end all the same things get tackled no matter what the approach though. You'll usually get drawn to the next thing, the right thing, if you're paying attention to your progress.

[...]

> Q: Has Spira realized he has a free will yet? Or is he still droning on and on about choicelessness?

He doesn't touch "first cause", but without it you can't release state into choiceless awareness in the first place. Initial understanding comes from a brief cessation of creation. At which point, interfering is optional, you can just let momentum roll, or create consciously.

The limits of text, here, however can be a bit of a restriction. The interview highlights the battle involved and the value of in-person dialogue, the persistence of deep assumptions. Talking in person is always a "feeling out" which is quite difficult to replicate in other modes. Why when it is so obvious are people resistant to the truth? Because it is not obvious, and in fact plainly wrong, to them.

> Q: You know, I think Spira does say a lot of really helpful things. But I'll never forgive him for talking about choicelessness, because he's actually ignoring a very important aspect of experience, which is volition. I am guessing he sees volition in purely negative terms and wants to eliminate it. He doesn't see that volition can also be liberative and skillful and be the cause of liberation rather than an obstacle on the way to it.

I think you misunderstand the choiclessless awareness thing - or I place a limit on it. One or the other. Anyway, I see it as you can experience choosing and doing but you aren't actually controlling it (that's theatre), but we do have free will but at the very base level of being: we can change the shape of ourselves by ourselves, reform our experience directly at the root. That's not choosing or willing, that's *becoming*. Yeah, everyday people quite like breathing and stuff. But also, the concepts you inheret you tend to literally experience as true in your dream-world. It pre-informs the partitioning of experience into content. That's why magickal traditions focus on belief adoption or belief circumvention.

It's momentum and occasional intervention. Our pal Neville had that susses: Deterministic paths occasionally re-directed by conscious overwriting.

What we call "Will" just *is* your being changing shape. Willing implies there's a "you" and a "target", when that's not the case at all (except conceptually, when *thinking-about*).

Our beliefs are all around us, so that (once understood) is justification enough.

I think you are too focussed on Will as "continuous manipulation", or that's how it seems. How tiring and effortful! Take a step back and see the imagery of the moment unfold, and as the play proceeds, give occasional directorial instructions. The focus is on enjoyment, and occasional enhancement. (This is choicelessless + creation.) Kick off the domino sequence, put your finger in the way if you want it to topple elsewhere. A power that requires constant maintenance, moment by moment effortful re-creation, is no power at all. Will

as you describe it does imply separation and strain. Grasping. Fighting. Desperation. Personal identity is an occasional thought plus a persistent sensation. Both are just "object content" within experience.

> Q: My thinking about will is so different from yours that you should not make any assumptions about my will based on yours. So don't say my way is effortful.

That's how you make it sound! Exactly as if you are trying to overcome something. Destroy something and overcome something. But there are no such things. Perhaps it is just your phrasing. So, I don't see volition as effort at all, simply a decision, a seeding and a redirecting.

[...]

> Q: Making a distinction between personal or other kinds of perspectives is pointless.

It is vital in terms of communication, the context changes the meaning. How can you fight your own habits? They are you. You can change and become, but you can't fight yourself - that implies and persists the same patterns. Fighting recreates the foe. And if you are fighting yourself, you are fighting the world. The world is just a mirage arising from the contours of your own memory traces, your own habitual structure, as subtle patterns in awareness. Freedom is the ability to change one's shape, to shift one's contours, to temporary or ongoing effect; there is no other freedom.

> Q: "Freedom is the ability to change one's shape, to shift one's contours, to temporary or ongoing effect; there is no other freedom." Of course.

This is fundamental. There is "what is the nature of experience" (patterns in and of awareness) and this (how the patterns and so the world can be changed). When changing one's shape, one might feel resistance and call this "effort", but that is a sign of the stability or depth of an existing pattern, coupled with your identification with it.

> Q: What's directly and what's indirectly? I don't know how to make a distinction like that. On the basis of what is such a distinction made?

You're talking about messing around with the mirage; just change the landscape! It's like trying to change the movie by drawing on the screen or talking over the soundtrack. Just update the script! To create or amend habits by generating experiences, thereby leaving trace memories, is the long way round. Just change the traces.

On effort: it's not a good thing, or not. One shouldn't aim to create the experience of effort particularly; it's just a byproduct.

[...]

I disagree that untrained people's attention drifts to the status quo. What it actually does is constantly jump and attach itself to sources of pain that need resolved, so they wilfully choose distractions. It keeps moving! That's why people have to really concentrate on tasks, because they've got a backlog of things their attention wants to... attend to and release.

>Q: Precisely. That's what I meant by status quo. This kind of choppy experience is habituated into the mind and is effortless actually. So without effort, this choppy flighty back and forth is what you

> get as someone under the influence of materialism and its attendant concerns for the body, social acceptance, etc.

No, it is very effortful - the effort of avoidance. It's subtle, but always there. If you truly give up, then it settles out after your "stuck thoughts and incomplete movements" resolve themselves.

> > Q: If what you say were true, then stopping would be easy and natural and then everyone could become liberated in one afternoon reliably, like a machine.

It's not easy, because it can be quite unpleasant, and it's also transparent - people don't realise they are compulsively forcing their attention (deliberately contracting and deforming themselves) or compulsively creating distractions, because the thing with avoidance is you often don't know you are avoiding. And the thing with effort is that if it's constant, your can be quite unaware of it - until you stop. "Seeing the nature of things", I can give you right now. Unravelling your accumulated patterns, wide open attention that never shifts? Longer. There's nothing to be done about it, but you do need the courage to do nothing.

People will find any excuse to avoid doing, say, a daily releasing exercise that involves simply lying on the floor - because they know things will come up. And they'll feel fear. Letting go completely is required in order to retrieve your power, but everything you've ever run away from will be waiting for you when you do and will hit you if you hold back even a little bit.

> > Q: If this deformation required effort, they'd notice! They don't notice it because it's effortless.

You're wrong. Habitual effort becomes the normal background. Clench your fist for an hour and you'll not longer notice it. Try to open your fist subsequently and you'll feel pain; it'll be easier to stay clenched. If you instead *let your fist go*, stop holding onto it, then it'll gradually release.

> > Q: That's one way. I call that non-conceptual relaxation. The thing is to practice non-conceptual relaxation you need to be highly realized already and you have to understand how it's different from ordinary relaxation.

There's nothing to understand. Just stop messing with your attention (although realising you *are* controlling your attention is subtle; however, that is what 'realisation' actually is).

Yes, minor movement is helpful - Tai Chi, for instance - mainly because it sneakily expands your attention to fill out the body space and beyond. It's actually a theraputic technique: drawing attention from the head-space and other locations, into the body. Lots of "character conditions" are effectively localised attention. (I found some good info and techniques in *The Psychology of the Body*, Elliot Greene, which is written for massage therapists. Worked well.)

However, still, these - like Alexander Technique "instructions" - are basically cheats for getting you or someone else to expand (or rather, *cease contracting*) your spatial awareness. Because for most people, telling them to do that directly wouldn't make any sense to them.

Habits are memory traces in "mind", and persist unless you allow them to release via recognition and acceptance, or you overwrite them. You don't need effort, just intention. What form could effort possibly take? What is effort made from? Every object in this room is a habit.

> Q: This makes no sense. Volition isn't separate from my being and neither is attention which is a partial function of volition. I can't stop it anymore than the Space can stop allowing objects through it.

How does it make no sense? People interfere with their attention in an attempt to manipulate themselves instead of simply intending, just as they tense their muscles in order to move when they could simply direct themselves in a more general sense and let the correct movement happen.

This where we're going wrong. I'm assuming we're talking from the point of view of the background already, not a "person". Effort is imaginary, from my view. Or better: it is the experience of intending something contrary to the existing momentum. You don't do effort, it's a sensation you have.

> Q: It's much easier to just go to the doctor and fix a tooth

Easier still, the dentist! But why did you have the problem in the first place? There is no separation between me and attention, or me and that table. Attention is a subtle object, a deformation.

An imaginary hammer might seem to hit an imaginary nail, but it builds towards nothing. "Effort is a sensation" - yes, it's actually the sensation of resistance, of existing established patterns, rather than the sensation of doing or overcoming. Attention is an object, it has shape and is relative. It is regularly removed, as in dissolves into the background. Most people fall asleep at that point.

[...]

> Q: TriumphantGeorge, a question: in that article it is implored that we cease the will of creation for a moment. How does one do this? Daily releasing exercise / meditation? ... nvm I feel like I've got it.

Yeah, just... stop.

[...]

What *is* that subconsciousness do you think?

> Q: just his inner self

And where is that?

> Q: it's part of him. I feel a circle coming up.

Me too :-) So, where is he?

> Q: I am afraid I don't know his address...

No. 1 Infinite Street, Everywhere City, Entirety NA.

> Q: Does that mean that I can visit him even from my sofa under my bed cover or does it mean that I am himself as well?

Yes and no. Both he and you live at the same address, always, although you suffer from the illusion that you occupy different rooms.

An Imaginary Tree

An Imaginary Conversation About An Imaginary Tree

> “If a tree falls in the forrest and nobody is there, doesn't it make a sound?”

Well, no, because "sound" is a word indicating a human experience. And with no experiencer, there is no "sound".

> “Okay, but there's a vibration produced by the impact, yes?”

Well, no, because "vibration" is another sort of observation, detected by feeling or by instrumentation. With no person or instrumentation beside the tree, there is no "vibration".

> “So if I put a detector by the tree, and get a signal on my equipment miles away, there was a vibration?”

You might call it that, but in fact what there will be is a light illuminating on your equipment. The "vibration" will be a thought in your mind, as a result of that illuminated light.

> “But, if I go back to the forrest, I see the tree lying there, it *must* have fallen, even if I wasn't there!”

No. Right now, imagine a tree in the forrest. Okay? Imagine that tree wobbling, tumbling, crashing into the ground. You are imagining the tree "falling", yes, experiencing the "falling" of this tree?

Okay, now - *don't* imagine that.

Did the tree still "fall"? And is there a forrest? If so, where is it? Can you point to it?

[...]

I'm a big fan of *Three Dialogues (George Berkeley)*, actually. The only place it falters is requiring that objects be experienced in the mind of God in order to persist - but that's because he assumed that the "world" was laid out spatially in a way similar to how we perceive it. If we see the universe as instead subtly "enfolded" into the space around us right now, then we are all the observers that maintain the world, just not in its object-based form. The entirety of existence, all time and space, is present in the room in which you are reading this. (The post is an attempt to lead to that thinking, in the most efficient way possible.)

> > Q: Interesting. I've been getting into holographic universe theory recently, not sure if that applies to what you're saying but it seems like it could. I reconcile Berkeleys mind of god by understanding God through the lens of spinoza (even though Berkeley says he's opposed to spinoza - I don't think he is). I'm not sure I can do spinoza justice but, the way I understand it (crudely) - basically spinoza proves that anything that exists is God due to the way the universe must unfold.

Yes, similar to the holographic idea, via David Bohm's *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*. If we follow the story from the start of the universe - an undivided, structureless aware blanket-like material folds upon itself, so it can experience relative to itself, then folds again, and so on - we can reach something which permits the Berkleyesque view. Since the material itself is not an object - objects are just the patterns within it - the material gives us the property that "everything, everywhen is everywhere all at once, right now" at the

background level, giving us the holographic view's benefits at the same time. Of course, we can never conceptualise it "independently", because our concepts shape our experience. The very notion of parts and patterns creates the experience of parts and patterns, for instance.

So, stopping being an object and noticing this background is like stepping off your front doorstep and instantly becoming the whole universe. One small step for a man...

MANAS & The Subjective Reader

I've been finding a few inspiring gems in the old MANAS journal editions, available free online. Some of them are about subjectivity and reality, others are more about society - e.g. issues of conformity and freedom. Lots to wade through, but people might find things that interest them re: the larger picture of world-creation.

> [MANAS is a journal of independent inquiry, concerned with the study of the principles which move world society on its present course, and with searching for contrasting principles- that may be capable of supporting intelligent idealism under the conditions of the twentieth century. MANAS is concerned, therefore, with philosophy and with practical psychology, in as direct and simple a manner as the editors and contributors can write. The word "manas" comes from a common root suggesting "man" or "the thinker." Editorial articles are unsigned, since MANAS wishes to present ideas and viewpoints, not personalities.
>
> -- http://www.manasjournal.org]

Here's an example of an article that's interesting on Theodore Roszak and linking objective vs subjective science. Sample quote:

> [“I would like to help you gain an appreciation that came to me only slowly, painfully, and with much difficulty: how our intellectual concepts and beliefs limit our ability to perceive what is really happening in the world. When the world "was" flat, the heavens "had" to move around the earth. We see the world through the blinders of our own beliefs. When the world's behavior resists our expectations, as now seems to be the case in many areas of policy analysis, we need to question whether some of our important beliefs are in accord with reality. Unfortunately, our most basic beliefs are seldom accessible to our conscious mind: they appear to us as simple, unquestionable observations about reality. . . .
>
> To truly see that one of your own beliefs is just an assumption can be liberating. This experience, though, is not amenable to precise programming. You must stretch your mind, envelop your beliefs with contrary thinking, and allow your imagination to roam in forbidden territory without automatically rejecting its perceptions as "absurdities." . . . By holding fast to certain beliefs, you may be denying a part of yourself that would come to the surface if you were willing to accept a somewhat different set of values or beliefs. . . . What I am suggesting derives from a belief in the indivisible unity of life and, therefore, in the importance of making work an integral part of the whole. . . .
>
> To be able to integrate your life, however, you will first need to re-examine your unquestioning belief in the superiority of "objective" over "subjective" research, a belief apparent in your condemnation of what you consider subjectivity in my writing. Until you relinquish this belief, you will be afraid to approach work with feeling as well as intellect for fear of losing your much-valued objectivity. But, pure "objectivity" doesn't exist, since any observations, experiments, or analysis must always be done by a person, who inescapably must have values, emotions, and feelings that influence his or her work. . . .

> You seem, however, to believe that because you desire to be objective you will be immune to those passions, prejudices, and dominating opinions which "are the abundant source of dangerous illusion." [Laplace.] What nonsense. I am sure that Laplace would agree with me that those most likely to be led into dangerous illusions by their emotions are those who would deny most vehemently that emotion played any role in shaping their opinions about "objective" truth. . . .
>
> I have no desire to deny that my views of the world influence my work. You term this "subjectivity" and denounce it soundly. I term it "wisdom" and recommend it highly. By drawing on all of my perceptions of the world, I believe I obtain a more complete and coherent view of the world processes that are unfolding than would be possible if I limited myself to information that I process intellectually and analytically. In a sense, I work backwards from my overall view of the world to the specifics of a given problem, applying tests of logic and evidence to check the correctness of the perceptions derived initially as well as from thinking."
>
> -- Vince Taylor quote, *No Precise Programming*, Manas Journal, Volume XXXII 1979]

[...]

Here's a New York Times article people might find interesting, in promotion to his new book, *The Vanishing Itself*:

> [Sam Harris: I don't actually argue that consciousness is "a reality" beyond the grasp of science. I just think that it is conceptually irreducible — that is, I don't think we can fully understand it in terms of unconscious information processing. Consciousness is "subjective"— not in the pejorative sense of being unscientific, biased or merely personal, but in the sense that it is intrinsically first-person, experiential and qualitative.]

Here's an article on Buddhism and its view of the mind, which references materialism, physics, the soul, and so on:

> Thick books have been written on both sides of this debate, which shows no sign of going away. Personally, I believe that physicalism can be refuted by a few moments of honest introspection. Consider the simple fact of "knowing. Not the process of knowing any-thing in particular, but the raw fact of just knowing in and of itself. All our perceptions and imaginations can be analyzed into process of sense organ, nerves and neurons but they all end up at this irreducible pristine simplicity. There is something at the end of the chain that "just knows." This immediate knowing, consciousness per se, is so simple, immediate and uncompounded that it cannot be explained in terms of any algorithm (step by step process.)

Here's an interview in *Scientific American* with Carlo Rovelli, which might be of interest to those who see 'science as the search for truth' or physics as necessarily materialist:

> *Horgan:* Do multiverse theories and quantum gravity theories deserve to be taken seriously if they cannot be falsified?

> *Rovelli:* No.
>
> *Horgan:* Can physics—or science in general—ever completely solve the mystery of the universe?
>
> *Rovelli:* What is the "mystery of the universe"? There isn't a "mystery of the universe." There is an ocean of things we do not know. Many of them we'll figure out, if we continue to be somewhat rational and do not kill one another first (which is well possible.) There will always be plenty of things that we will not understand, I think, but what do I know? In any case, we are very very very far from any complete comprehension of everything we would like to know.

There's an article in *Scientific American* by Christof Koch which might be worth a glance, entitled *Is Consciousness Universal?*

> Panpsychism, the ancient doctrine that consciousness is universal, offers some lessons in how to think about subjective experience today.
>
> Taken literally, panpsychism is the belief that everything is "enminded." All of it. Whether it is a brain, a tree, a rock or an electron. Everything that is physical also possesses an interior mental aspect. One is objective—accessible to everybody—and the other phenomenal—accessible only to the subject.

It's not subjective idealism, but it is a counter to materialism, and therefore some of the same arguments fit.

Linked to *Scientific American*'s Rovelli interview mentioned earlier, there are also interviews with Rupert Sheldrake on morphic resonance and telepathy and with George Ellis on physicists and philosophy.

> *Sheldrake:* Morphic resonance is the influence of previous structures of activity on subsequent similar structures of activity organized by morphic fields. It enables memories to pass across both space and time from the past. The greater the similarity, the greater the influence of morphic resonance. What this means is that all self-organizing systems, such as molecules, crystals, cells, plants, animals and animal societies, have a collective memory on which each individual draws and to which it contributes. In its most general sense this hypothesis implies that the so-called laws of nature are more like habits.

and

> *Ellis:* Many scientists are strong reductionists who believe that physics alone determines outcomes in the real world, This is demonstrably untrue – for example the computer on which I am writing this could not possibly have come into being through the agency of physics alone.
>
> *Ellis:* Yes [I believe in free will]. Einstein is perpetuating the belief that all causation is bottom up. This simply is not the case, as I can demonstrate with many examples from sociology, neuroscience, physiology, epigenetics, engineering, and physics. Furthermore if Einstein did not have free will in some meaningful sense, then he could not have been responsible for the theory of relativity – it would have been a product of lower level processes but not of an intelligent mind choosing between possible options.

When discussing consciousness, the materialist viewpoint is that it is an emergent phenomenon that arises from, and is correspondent with, the brain. An article from *Science Magazine* from 2007 highlights this case:

> There's a young student at this university,"says Lorber, "who has an IQ of 126, has gained a first-class honours degree in mathematics, and is socially completely normal. *And yet the boy has virtually no brain.* "The student's physician at the university noticed that the youth had a slightly larger than normal head, and so referred him to Lorber, simply out of interest.
>
> "When we did a brain scan on him,"Lorber recalls, "we saw that instead of the normal 4.5-centimeter thickness of brain tissue between the ventricles and the cortical surface, there was just a thin layer of mantle measuring a millimetre or so.His cranium is filled mainly with cerebro-spinal fluid."

More here and here on related cases:

> “If a photo [brain scan] like that had landed in my hands without my knowing anything about the person, I’d have guessed the individual was nearly dead", says brain researcher Siri Graff Leknes, of the Department of Psychology at the University of Oslo.
>
> “This is an extreme example illustrating that we can’t necessarily determine the functionality of a person from the appearance of their brain structure,” she says.

The First Tulpa

Introducing Tulpas

According to the definition at the /r/tulpas subreddit, a “tulpa” is an imaginary friend which has its own thoughts and emotions, and that you can interact with. It is an apparently independent consciousness existing within the creator’s mind. It has its own opinions, feelings, form and movement. It is an additional “person” within your consciousness. Tulpas are created deliberately, but can arise accidentally.

Deliberate Tulpas

Deliberate creation involves regular *forcing*, where the host deliberately visualises and interacts with the expectation of the presence of the tulpa - implicitly seeding it by giving it attention and expectation. At some point, the tulpa develops sentience and begins to act of its own volition.

Another aspect of tulpa creation is the development of a mindscape or “wonderland” - basically, a persistent mental environment where the host and the tulpa can interact and explore together, without having to “overlay” the tulpa over the everyday world experience.

Accidental Tulpas

An accidental tulpa, such as a childhood imaginary friend which may persist into adulthood, does not arise by deliberate forcing. How does such a tulpa come to be? Perhaps by *expectation and implication*.

The child's need for company and exploration of itself via another *implies* an additional consciousness with which to interact. Alternatively, it may be that the development of the child at an early stage involved the creation of multiple sentient aspects, of which one became primary.

The First Tulpa

As a child, we are passive and receptive. Over time the actions of others towards us implies that we have a sentient personality - that we are a "person" or have a person inside us. Responses are expected of us that align with this notion. In short, the world around us *forces* the empty mind to come up with a sentient personality in the same way as we might force a tulpa. In fact, oneironauts all know that the “person” they experience themselves to be is not who they really are. I am the *awareness* in which that “person” resides. The “person” itself is in fact nothing more than a tulpa: *the first tulpa*, which we confuse as being ourselves. In fact, it could be said to be *our-self*, it's just not what we *are*; it's something we *have*.

And what of the world around me? It seems stable enough, a persistent environment where the person can interact and explore. Like a “wonderland” for the first tulpa, in fact:

> “A mindscape/wonderland can be imagined in such a way that large areas of it are undefined or lack clarity. Traveling within the environment outside of areas you've consciously defined can lead to a subconscious, dreamlike generation of environments and landscapes. This has been known to provide interesting and exciting activities for tulpa and their creators alike - it is quite literally letting your mind wander.”
>
> — *What does it mean to ‘explore’ a wonderland*, Tulpa Subreddit FAQ

You are awareness, and you have passively created a wonderland and a tulpa with which to explore it. The person you think you are is just your first tulpa.

With this knowledge, you might choose to create others, to delete your first tulpa and take your stand as the creator, and you might even consider amending your wonderland to a more pleasing layout, for a more flexible existence...

[...]

> Q (cosmicprankster420): If I am just awareness, why is it that i have a preference for certain types of tulpas, or is that the original tulpa creating tulpas of its own?

Thinking it's not awareness that has the preference.

Other tulpas: I'm thinking it happens just by implication. The first tulpa implies further tulpas by expectation and implication, in the same way it was created. I don't see "ego" as central overall, in the larger picture. The ego is an idea that you have, and because you identify with it you end up with thoughts and actions that arise consistently with it, out of expectation. Other regions of awareness end up with the same thing: behaviour via expectation, clustered around an idea, from deliberate or accidental *forcing*.

So it depends on where you "stand". If you are standing as /u/cosmicprankster420 then you experience a world that is implied by that tulpa, and that includes other tulpas. If you stand as awareness itself, then you no longer take the perspective of the first tulpa, and this no longer applies. But I'm not sure I've understood your idea of a "middle self" properly!

EDIT: Synchronicity alert: As I was typing that, the YouTube series *WTF Moments from MoveClips.com* I had in the background played the "there is no spoon" clip from *The Matrix*. Although this was immediately followed by a clip from *Mr Bean*. Make of that what you will.

> Q: His middle self idea carries two constituent parts. First is like a Platonic Form. Using his example, his middle self carries a certain attribute that is transmitted to tulpa-selves, in this case Green. Second, it's almost like the HGA concept. A higher self that stands as an intermediary between the Ego and the All.
>
> Edit: I encourage any of my psychonautic friends to eat their preferred mushroom and read my post. I'm freaking myself out at this point.

Ah, I see it. Well, there can be endless subtleties of patterns within the awareness that we are; a pattern of predominant "green-ness" could indeed precede/seed subsequent manifestations. It wouldn't need to be a "conscious choice" as such, simply a bias in the pattern. (i.e. None of them are really "doing" anything.)

[...]

I like the interpretation, although the tulpa is not meant to share the same form as the host. However, with the First Tulpa, who's to say a Second Tulpa can't have equal bidding, and perhaps take over? Maybe it's more like the recent BBC America TV Series, *The Intruders*.

> Q: Alan Moore describes an interesting experience he had with someone else's tulpa that he was able to interact with...

Very interesting, thanks. It bridges the boundary between tulpas as practiced on that sub (create a sentient consciousness, spend time in a wonderland) and the Tibetan twist (actual materialisation, in this wonderland). The difference may of course just be one of limited beliefs, and hence constrained experience, today. In other words, the level of "solidity" required for most people to perceive a form may be much higher than it was previously. Still, interesting they experienced her differently visually. Does "everyone" experience *us* the same, I wonder?

> AesirAnatman: Another thing I was thinking about as I've been mulling over your post is that other people are all indistinguishable from well-developed tulpas that are occupying a well-developed mindscape. **Earth is just another mindscape in our imagination.**

Yes, exactly! This is what I'm saying with the final paragraph: You are the First Tulpa in your awareness, and all around you are the other tulpas you have created - some by request, some by implication, all unwittingly - to explore your mind together as this unfolding wonderland...

[...]

> Q: Believers in tulpae are like dogs mistaking their own reflections as others. Only in this case it's a mental reflection. If you think that deluding yourself into thinking like a stupid dog is an accomplishment, you have my greatest sympathy.

The point is that people are *already* deluded, before they get involved in deliberate tulpa creation.

> Q: Yes, one of the big things is that people will make a "tulpa" of other people, projecting their own thoughts etc into others when it's completely unwarranted (I was guilty of this in the past with extreme social anxiety, thankfully I was able to completely cure it.) Gods themselves are just "tulpae."

> And of course method acting is just sort of like being your own tulpa.

"Stimulant" is a related concept = Your internal representation or simulation of other people that you use to understand the meaning of their actions, anticipate their responses to yours. Difference is the underlying assumptions about experience: One is your model vs an external world and person, the other is seeing people as an actual part of [the larger] you. Separating the two experiential would be challenging, since from your localised perspective the evidence is identical.

The Circular Ruins

> “The purpose which guided him was not impossible, though supernatural. He wanted to dream a man; he wanted to dream him in minute entirety and impose him on reality. This magic project had exhausted the entire expanse of his mind; if someone had asked him his name or to relate some event of his former life, he would not have been able to give an answer. This uninhabited, ruined temple suited him, for it is contained a minimum of visible world; the proximity of the workmen also suited him, for they took it upon themselves to provide for his frugal needs. The rice and fruit they brought him were nourishment enough for his body, which was consecrated to the sole task of sleeping and dreaming.”
>
> -- *The Circular Ruins*, Jorge Luís Borges

To know you are not a person, this can be done. Releasing your hold upon content and therefore attention, your focus loosens and expands, deepens: you re-identify as the world. To discover that you and all experiences are made of consciousness, the non-material material whose only property is awareness, that is easy. However, it is the *patterns* within this consciousness that constrain your perspective, not the nature of it. What are you *beyond* the world? What is its context? How can you perceive outwith a container that *has no boundary*, escape from a *room without walls?*

[...]

Intended to be provocation for contemplation, of course.

> > Q: I am something within which visions of the world bubble up and settle down. I am not the world.

So you cannot escape its container, you cannot escape its walls, because it isn't and it hasn't There isn't a way to get beyond yourself, to run away from what is within yourself.

> > Q: It's what we believe about the patterns or even what we think we know about the patterns that constrains us.

Yes, but here beliefs are *also* patterns and what we think about the patterns is *also* patterns. An expectation is a structure too. It's better to dissolve the expectation/belief patterns directly, rather than attempting to dissolve the sensory patterns, since it is the former that funnel or shape the experience of the latter.

> > Q: Just don't imagine that you're bound and the need to escape vanishes.

The *imagining* of containment is an issue. But even when this is disposed of, any attempt of struggle to escape or overcome your situation by engaging with it *implies* restriction again. You're right that an embracing of "wild opportunity" is good. It works in part because it involves shifting attention away from restriction, rather than fighting it.

(When we "dissolve" something, this is actually poor use of language. We do nothing with the something at all; rather we leave it be and have the replacement empty space form as your experience in its stead.)

> > Q: Direct, indirect, 180 degrees

Yes, "direct" and "indirect", I've used confusingly there, because they change by context. So I should clear it up:

- An enfolded general habit-of-the-world ("people always punch me") is best tackled by attending to that habit rather than specific instances. Dealing with individual instances of being punched will, over time, change the pattern but very slowly; amending the source pattern (belief, whatever) will take the whole lot down much quicker.

  versus:

- A one-off situation which you want to tackle specifically. For instance, a particular confrontation has arisen in a parking lot. There is not trend of parking-lot-confrontations; just this one. (It may have arisen due to multiple sources, which could be dealt with if they are revealed, but right now that is not obvious.) You attend to the accompanying sense and "dissolve" (re-identify with) that.

The difference could probably be termed as "general facts" (going direct to the general source pattern) rather than "singular fact" (going direct to the singular source pattern).

> Q: I don't think we can dissolve the patterns. We can change them.

I think I said this in the last comment, but maybe it was somewhere else. "Dissolve" doesn't mean it disappears as such; it means you change the "shape of that part of reality" to something preferable. Which may be just open space. If *feels* like dissolving though, because the *form* fades. It's more of (as I said) a re-identifying and therefore a removal of boundary.

> Q: The difference is that I am not allowing myself to objectify all the patterns by grouping them into a single category.

Well, patterns are allowed to be in multiple categories at once. Just because I decide to call motorised wheeled vehicles "automobiles" doesn't mean I've restricted myself from referring to particular styles and brands and engine constructions.

> Q: So there is a relatively passive and repetitive pattern and a more malleable pattern which can become the leading edge of change.

Which is which?

> Q: ...without bending the rules of the world,

If you want to stay in the same world, you change the "fact" that corresponds to the the immediate experience. Basically, "the fact that this particular thing is happening right now". If you want to live in a world where such things don't occur, then you want to the change the broader "facts" which have (excuse language) funnelled experience in this direction.

> Q: The conceptual skeleton [is more malleable]

This probably varies - depends on the extent to which the "conceptual skeleton" (facts which are not present right now) underpin your own identity. How does the conceptual skeleton differ from the "real thing"? Isn't it just a difference of location? By which I mean, a thought "over here" and an event "over there" are both instances of the conceptual skeleton being "unfolded".

Drinking the Transcendental Idealism

I've been reading up on Immanuel Kant's concept of *Transcendental Idealism* and I'm finding it quite an appealing take on the "world as mind-formatting" view. The exact interpretation of Kant's philosophy is still debated even now. With the ideas of Oneirosophy in mind, though, I'd say it takes on a clearer shape than it might otherwise.

The essentials are: **We experience the formatting of our own minds**; sensory experience is not what things are *in themselves*; even time and space, cause and effect, are something we bring to experience. That we apparently share a similarly ordered world - what Kant calls *empirical realism* - is down to our minds being similarly formatted (as "human beings").

Kant at the Bar: Transcendental Idealism in Daily Life over at *Philosophy Now* (see EDIT) is quite a nice overview of Immanuel Kant's metaphysics, in a breezy read. Although I'd say it makes an error by referring to "the physical data our senses receive" at one point, for instance, it's pretty good at covering the basics.

Meanwhile, from the Wikipedia entry:

> "The salient element here is that space and time, rather than being real things-in-themselves or empirically mediated appearances (German: Erscheinungen), are the very forms of intuition (German: Anschauung) by which we must perceive objects. They are hence neither to be considered properties that we may attribute to objects in perceiving them, nor substantial entities of themselves. They are in that sense subjective, yet necessary, preconditions of any given object insofar as this object is an appearance and not a thing-in-itself. Humans necessarily perceive objects as located in space and in time. This condition of experience is part of what it means for a human to cognize an object, to perceive and understand it as something both spatial and temporal. . .
>
> . . .Kant's view is better characterized as a two-aspect theory, where noumena [world as it is] and phenomena [world as sensed] refer to complementary ways of considering an object."
>
> -- *Transcendental Idealism*, Wikipedia

[...]

> [**Utthana**: Kant was close to figuring shit out. He made a few strange steps that I'm fairly comfortable dismissing, but he was pretty close, and this is one of my favorites of his and something I referenced in that essay I wrote.
>
> Space and time as *a priori* conditions for experience is really interesting to play with, and of course you'll find it's impossible to imagine anything non-spatial or non-temporal, so this conclusion comes fairly naturally to anyone inclined toward any variant on idealism. And the important implication is that space and time are neither properties -nor- substantial entities. So they're subjective, they're part of -you-, not anything apart from you.

> And I think the idea of space and time being -you- is something which was kind of skipped over by... the thousands and thousands of Westerners who have studied Kant. Either because it wasn't processed fully, was ignored as crazy, or just found a niche in an otherwise mundane worldview they held.
>
> Another thing to take away from this is the fact that there are some Western philosophers who actually do have some ideas to offer, and are worth considering. I've learned a lot from Western philosophers, even if I had to filter a lot out as well. /r/oneirosophy might benefit from a bit of a book club where we discussed some texts apart from those we compose ourselves. I've certainly arrived here only through the likes of Kant and Hanshan and the suttas. What reason do we have to think we all wouldn't benefit from discussing some texts like those?]

Good points. [*"Kant was close to figuring shit out."]*; He may even actually have sussed it all out but been unable to convey it in the conceptual culture of his time. Definitely, I think many of the problems with Kant are problems of modern (and contemporary) interpretation. That time and space are basically part of the "senses" is a vital component. I can see how it got overlooked, because I think people never understood that *this moment right now, in consciousness, is sensory*, that there is no spatially-extended unfolding world beyond it that you are exploring. The *facts-of-the-world* are dimensionless.

Instead, they tended to think of "this" spatially-extended world and then another world which was the source of that one. Getting that wrong leads to confusion about there being two things, or two aspects of one thing, and so on.

["Another thing to take away from this is the fact that there are some Western philosophers who actually do have some ideas to offer, and are worth considering."]; Things get lost to history too. In the early part of the 20th century, authors like E. Douglas Fawcett (*The World As Imagination*) and JW Dunne (*The Serial Universe*) were popular - particularly the latter, whose *An Experiment With Time* was well-known and influential. Such books are full of ideas of static time, collapsed space, and the observer as a consciousness who brings the dead world into 3D/4D life. Those ideas were the *Brief History of Time* of their, um, time.

Really, insights just get rediscovered for modern times. Fashions of understanding come and go, based on power-struggles rather than correctness. Theories die and are forgotten because their proponents die and are forgotten. We not on a grand march of progress into the future.

It may be that, since these metaphysical worldviews give power to every individual, they are naturally sidelined by parties who have certain economic interests at heart. Not in some sort of conspiracy, just that you pick the worldview that matches your desires, you then tend to promote that worldview, and when you become dominant in society then that is the worldview you will make dominant via education and law-making.

> > Q: Just for the record I want to mention that Kant's brand of idealism cannot be called "subjective." So Kant's idealism is not quite what I would call oneirosophy-grade. I think Kant believed that his mental constituents were in some sense given to him from on high.

Hmm. I think it's open to interpretation a little (there being at least three contrasting ones).

In my reading: The phenomenal *is* subjective, however he then suggests our "formatting" is the same, hence we have similar experiences (an intersubjective "empiral realism"). Not because externality exists in that way, but because we are that way. This accounts for other people reporting similar experiences - but it doesn't *necessarily* need to imply that there are other people in the sense of multiple formattings. It can be *one*

formatting, one experience, multiple perspectives. There doesn't need to be simultaneous distinct observers. But yeah - I think overall it's a nice description (because of its handling of space and time), but as always we take the useful bits and adapt them, put aside the rest.

The influence or connection between experiencer and formatting isn't really pursued, as I understand it. It might equate, but it doesn't recognise that we can manipulate (really: reshape).

Maybe say *knowingly* or not, rather than *consciously*? It's not that we are doing something we aren't aware we're doing, it's that we are doing something but aren't aware of its impact. (i.e. That *all* imagining establishes patterns which shape subsequent experiences,)

Also, many people don't realise that "feeling" is an imagining too, which triggers its associations. So for them that does seem "unconscious" - so perhaps there are two areas to highlight: doing stuff without realising the impact, and also not realising you are doing stuff.

[...]

> [Q: transcendental idealism vs subjective idealism. Can anyone go into deeper details?]
>
> **[A:**
>
> - **Subjective Idealism**: **Reality is a wholly subjective dream and no objective reality exists.**
> - **Transcendental Idealism**: here's an exercise to give you an idea. "everything" is impossible to grasp because there's too much of it, and it contains us. So how can we understand "everything"? Instead, we can understand "everything" by grasping its opposite, "nothingness", which is only 1 thing and much smaller than us.]

A Dream

Some Dream Reminders

> "In a deserted place in Iran there is a not very tall stone tower that has neither door nor window. In the only room (with a dirt floor and shaped like a circle) there is a wooden table and a bench. In that circular cell, a man who looks like me is writing in letters I cannot understand a long poem about a man who in another circular cell is writing a poem about a man who in another circular cell . . . The process never ends and no one will be able to read what the prisoners write."
>
> -- *A Dream*, Jorge Luís Borges

We each dream alone.

> "The world I perceive is entirely private, a dream."
>
> "The world you can perceive is a very small world indeed. And it is entirely private. Take it to be a dream and be done with it. Is not the idea of a total world a part of your personal world? The universe does not come to tell you that you are a part of it. It is you who have invented a totality to contain you as a part. In fact all you know is your own private world, however well you have furnished it with your imaginations and expectations."
>
> -- *Excerpts from Sri Nisargadatta Maharaj - Part Two -* also: *Part One*

Wherever you go, whatever you discover, it is only... *more dream*.

Bonus Read

Tlön, Uqbar, Orbis Tertius, also by Jorge Luís Borges, is a short story depicting an unknown country where a conspiracy of idealism takes place. Excerpt:

> "They cannot conceive that space can exist in time. The sight of a puff of smoke on the horizon and then of a burning field and then of a half-stubbed-out cigar that produced the blaze is deemed an example of the association of ideas."
>
> -- *Tlön, Uqbar, Orbis Tertius*, Jorge Luís Borges

[...]

We might also ask how our dream is formed. Patterns arising and stabilising via hypnogogia is one way of describing this. Our ongoing reality may be thought of as no more than pattern triggering in noise, feeding back on itself.

> > Q: Right. I'm starting to view it like this too. The fact that the forms have evolved to be this vivid, this complex, it's rather... incredibly remarkable. Remarkable. Interesting. I like to take a deeper look at words sometimes and I feel that in this context the word remarkable is interesting indeed. The

> forms are so interesting perhaps, that we feel compelled to "re-mark" our world with them, to recreate new and novel forms to attempt to satiate our undying appetite for creation.

Thing is, the "re-mark" process kinds happens by itself, like water waves sloshing around a tank, bouncing off each other, leading to new overall surface patterns, always changing.

The difference between many traditions and the oneirosophic approach is that, where others recognise this "self-happening illusion" as ourselves but encourage detachment and acceptance, we encourage detachment and occasional assertion: a "re-folding" of the material which constitutes us and our evolving experience.

It happens "by itself" as in it unfolds consistently with the present state. From below, I deliberately define terms:

On terminology: "intending" is the act of imposing a pattern onto consciousness; "the intention" is the form of the pattern being imposed. If you say "my intention is..." you are saying "the pattern I am imposing is..."

So the "intention" persists and has an ongoing effect, but you are not actively "intending" in an ongoing way to make the effect keep happening. Once you've made the deformation, it persists, provided any part of the extended pattern is active. This is important: superimposed patterns *apparently* evolve and unfold in time even though the patterns themselves (the accumulation of "intentions") do not change. This is why there is no effort in continuing to experience the world-pattern you have set up.

> > Q: Take what you call "just decide" and stop limiting it to a single moment. That's intent.

It's not limited to a single moment in "just decide", never has been. The act of activation takes place at a "moment" but the activation itself applies globally over all time and space (which also means the activation then didn't take place in a "moment", but there you go). It's a pattern which is overlaid upon the whole "world-pattern". There is no such thing as a momentary intent. All intention apples to all time. To the extent that your apparent past (i.e. future recall of memories) will change in alignment with your intent. Really, you are superimposing (or triggering) patterns upon patterns upon patterns. The superposition is what gives us the "world-pattern" and the *apparent* temporal segment of that (again a pattern) is what corresponds to the present experience. Like Moiré patterns.

> ["In mathematics, physics, and art, a **moiré pattern** or **moiré fringe** is a large-scale wave interference pattern that can be produced when a partially opaque ruled pattern with transparent gaps is overlaid on another similar pattern. For the moiré interference pattern to appear, the two patterns must not be completely identical, but rather displaced, rotated, or have slightly different pitch."
>
> - Wikipedia, "Moire Patterns"]



> > Q: My point is: there is no in-time act. There is an illusion of an act.

We've already covered this before, I think, stemming from: We don't "do" things, rather we "have the experience of doing".

You and I need a different word for intention. I use the word "act" and "activation" to indicate a self-shifting of the world-pattern which is subsequently experienced in the observations which follow. It happens *as change* but it does not happen *in time* (because time is actually a now-pattern upon which other now-patterns are hung; it is a flat thought-structure not an environment).

All that stuff about starting, stopping, moments and so on are artefacts of *thinking-about* experience.

> Q: I am saying the initiation (cause) is not something in-time.

Of course. Forget time. The "act" is a shifting of the whole world-pattern, which consists of all time laid out flat (for visualisation's sake). The "act" is not experienced, only the experiences associated with the shift. The "act" leaves no trace and therefore is not in time. There *is* change but it does not occur in time, which is itself a structure of within the world-pattern. We are inevitably bound to talk about things using language and illustrations which imply to "parts", "location", "space" and "moments" in "time". This is simply because we think by using "shadow-senses". As soon as you have divided something into concepts, you are dealing with parts, and parts are distinguished by location relative to one another in conceptual space. "Act" is maybe the broadest word. "Intending" and "intention" are traditionally good because they can't be imagined very solidly, but (as you are indicating) they can all too often be associated with the "feeling of doing" localised in apparent time.

For clarity: When I put "do" in quotes it is to indicate that I'm referring to the conventional usage of the word "do". Implying that the causing of experiences is not as traditionally thought; there is no cause in experience.

Another tac: "Doing" implies a there is a thing doing and a thing done-to. "Intending", by contrast, is shape-shifting of reality "across all time and space". Some of that reality might be presently sensorily "bright" and therefore a change would be experienced, some of it not.

If the world was a landscape, then our usual conception of "doing" would be getting a spade and digging around on the hill of the "present moment" to reshape it. However, the actuality of "intending" is that the landscape self-shifts to adopt a new topology as a whole, and any change of the hill of the present moment is a result of this. We tend to confuse this result with "doing".

> Q: I say that experience is inert, and has no own-power. So nothing experienced self-shifts. Whatever is experienced is shifted by something that is beyond experience and beyond convention altogether.

Exactly. Experience is a byproduct. Experience isn't doing anything, it is just the part of the landscape which happens to have sensory aspects. Only the landscape shifts and it shifts of its own self.

Ping-Pong Balls Metaphor

Imagine some ping-pong balls floating in a tank of water. (In this description, the water is already in a state of motion: ripples are moving along trajectories.) The ping-pong balls are all different colours. On one of them, a blue one, you write "me".

The balls float about, bouncing off each other, due to the trajectories of the waves of the water. As the "me" ball bounces off other balls, you say to yourself "I did that". However, you did nothing.

Now, you splash the water. The act of splashing in and of itself produces no change to balls, however it does modify the pattern of waves. The *subsequent* trajectory of *all* of the balls is therefore adjusted. At the point of splashing, the "me" ball might be moved ("I did this"), or it may not be moved for a while.

In this metaphor:

- The water is reality (or whatever you want to call it) or consciousness.
- The waves are the world-pattern as dissolved into consciousness.
- The balls are aspects of reality which have sensory aspects.
- The "me" ball is the misidentification with certain sensory aspects.
- The collisions between balls are "events" and the collision with the "me" ball are those events misconstrued as "things I do".
- The splashing of the water represents "intending", which is to change the landscape of reality, the *facts-of-the-world*.

Now obviously, we're having to use time and space here in the metaphor, whereas in fact the world-pattern is "static" and more akin to a set of superimposed patterns, dimensionless "facts" dissolved into the background. However, the purpose of the metaphor is to illustrate how the illusion of "doing" is brought about due to focusing on sensory aspects and identifying with part of that.

> Q: It doesn't shift of its own. Nothing does. Things shift when you shift. Or more specifically, your intentionality shifts.

Language tangle! The only thing there is, is you. The only shifting that happens, is you shifting. Hence the landscape metaphor earlier (the landscape changing its own topology).

> Q: In your metaphor there is own-power to the system that's independent of your involvement.

No, there isn't really: because the whole system *is you*. It is "the current shape of you". Which is what you've gone on to say. Bear in mind the metaphor is to illustrate a certain aspect! The reality has no moving parts, strictly, because it actually has no time element. But if you go all out then... you stop having a metaphor that illustrates anything.

> Q: Now both splashing and calm represent intending. In fact, in my version of your metaphor even the existence of the water tank, water, and the balls, represents intending.

Which... renders the word "intending" meaningless. That's why metaphors involve splitting things into parts for illustrative purposes. It's the whole "everything is consciousness" problem. The ultimate truth is basically worthless when it comes to discussion.

The whole universe is, in the end, your "intention" overall, since it begins with the first pattern created up until the most "recent". That's not very helpful as an explanation though, given that we aren't at this beginning now. We could call each change an "additional modification" or "an update to the intention", but most people are more comfortable with "intention" referring to a change to the current pattern.

We might talk about the "overall intention" of the system, though, to make this clearer.

> Q: Intending is ongoing instead of being limited to intermittent splashes.

I think it is better to say that *intention* is persistent, that its effect is ongoing, because intentions accumulate (superposition of patterns) and sum to the "overall intention". *Intending* is better reserved for the changing of the system to a new state. To avoid words like "acting" or "doing", which automatically imply subject and object, doer and done, to most people.

> Q: If the system was me, I couldn't be anything different from that water with ping pong balls.

I think you are just arguing against the structure of the metaphor, rather than what it represents. Strictly speaking, the whole of the metaphor is "you" and none of it has solidity it has simply "taken on the shape of" the patterns involved; the ping-pong balls merely indicate the current sensory aspects.

> Q: You even described it in your own words as "everything is on its own until you splash some water." I am saying, that never happens. There is no "until" in my view.

Again, you are arguing with the metaphor's structure rather than the meaning. Experience unfolds according to the world-pattern within consciousness until the world-pattern is updated. If your arms were frictionless and tireless and you windmilled them clockwise, they would continue "forever" in that direction until you intervened to reverse them (say). That intervention would be a change of state in the world-pattern; experience would unfold accordingly subsequently. The change would not occur in time, since the world-pattern retains no state in and of itself (although an apparent past may be a part of certain patterns).

The metaphor necessarily uses division and space and time, because all thought requires those things. This is why we cannot speak of the whole situation, only aspects of it, depending on what particular thing we are talking about.

> Q: Intending means whatever you find is ultimately what you intended to find.

You cannot "find" anything. As soon as you intend something, it is done. Intending a change in the world-pattern, the intention is already found.

> Q: [“Intending is better reserved for the changing of the system to a new state”]; I strongly disagree. I oppose this view.

I oppose your opposition! :-)

So, if all is consciousness which is me, and the shape of consciousness is the shape I adopt, which is the shape of the world - in its entirety and not just this present moment 3D sensory aspect; I am in effect experiencing the whole of reality right now - what else is there? There is no limit in terms of the possible experiences (including not-being-a-human) in this regard.

> Q: From the POV of metaphysics this is bad view.

I beg to differ (well I would wouldn't I?). Although of course the metaphor we're discussing is very much meant to offer a practical way of thinking, for usability, as you point out.

You seem to be bound to some notion of an *ongoing intending* when the perspective inherently dictates there is no time, and therefore no "ongoingness" available. There is only *state*. Of course, we can adopt any position or standpoint, and experience things relatively, but fundamentally that's the deal.

The "world-pattern" does not necessarily refer to "this planet" and "this body". The larger picture is one of associative patterning. More like a "memory block" of all possibilities (logically or actually, no difference essentially).

> Q: Consciousness is only the shiny property of mind, and consciousness displays only one single version of what all it could be displaying.

We're differing on our definition of consciousness then. I've been using it to be the "background awareness" rather than the particular content or structure. I agree on potential: all possibilities are implicit within that awareness. When I say you are experiencing the whole of reality, I don't mean that *this sensory experience* is all there is. I mean something more like the entire "logical space" is present and dissolved into awareness, of awareness, and is "being experienced" in that sense.

> Q: But there is a limit to what you can experience at one time.

I deny this - but only in the particular sense I mean above. This is why the "ping-pong balls" were the sensory aspect and "the water" was the entire structure. The point on "human formatting" vs "dolphin formatting" is good though. If they co-exist then you aren't aware of one and the other simultaneously; one does not "make sense" within the other.

> Q: Where your view is bad is it suggests inertia as something non-volitional.

There's no inertia at all, it's completely frictionless. Unfortunately there's a lack of physical-world things that can be used as a good metaphor! You are a "frictionless material" with no inherent boundaries or divisions which can change shape at any time. Think of a donkey! That was frictionless wasn't it? Your shape changed to be (partially) that of a donkey without any effort whatsoever. Think of a *running* donkey! Again there was no effort or resistance. The donkey changes direction! Did the thought-donkey encounter any inertia there? No. It's in this sense that I mean it. It's a completely non-physical change (as are all changes of course).

> Q: So intent is beyond time and ongoing, both.

Messy language. It'd prefer to say "has ongoing effect" rather than say it is ongoing. The *intention* is static but the *effect* is ongoing (even though that division is obviously arbitrary and language-based).

> Q: Configuration space is implicit in experience, but most beings don't realize it. So it's fair to say that in most cases configuration space is an unconscious feature that's shrouded by ignorance. Being constantly aware of the configuration space is a huge spiritual achievement. It's like being awake not only to what appears, but to what could be appearing and doesn't yet. That's not a state of mind common in humans.

Foolish beings! :-) All agreed on that section, although there is an "extra bit" where I'd go into the world-pattern being the entirety, and being able to dice it according to certain configuration perspectives (e.g. divide it into "moments" or... whatever). But that's just getting metaphorically out of control.

> Q: Experience is mostly identical to formatting. It's not something that arrives through vision or hearing or touch. It's not a percept. Rather, the intuition of a configuration space is concommitant with the percepts when one is wise.

I say... we are *always* aware of the pattern. Just because it isn't experienced sensorily (image, sound, texture, etc) doesn't mean you are not experiencing it right now. "Felt-sense", baby. And as you indicate, another word for this is "knowledge".

> Q: [There's no inertia at all, it's completely frictionless.] Then go back to your older posts and reread them.

Bah, you're wanting each metaphor to be all things, and it cannot. Each metaphor illustrates only an aspect and is always accompanied by a "but". The ping-pong balls do not wait for input; the water is already sloshing (frictionlessly) and can be redirected.

> Q: Rather the material self-shifts into patterns, but in this metaphor, the patterns have no own-being.

Of course not, but (and remember there's a larger audience in some discussions) if we cut straight to the "not-even-holographic open aware space which is inherently non-spatial and non-temporal and is empty but also full of patterns" it's not very useful, is it? ;-) We already agree on this area anyway. The only areas we disagree are: the patterning of the world and, the description for intention/intending.

> Q: Raise your body temperature by 20 degrees Celcius, NOW! Did it work? A bit more difficult than changing your thought pattern, isn't it?

No, it's perfectly easy. I can intend this no problem. And that intention (pattern) is instantly overlaid upon the world-pattern. However, it doesn't result in a particularly strong change in sensory experience, relative to the contribution of more established patterns (i.e. body is at body-temperature), habits of the world. If I were to "forget" some of those habits then the strength of the contribution would be subject to less cancelling out. All intending instantly creates the intentional pattern and it contributes from that point onwards. The extent to which the contribution results in a sensorily significant result is another issue.

> Q: [The intention is static but the effect is ongoing] I don't agree.

Intending instantly incorporates an additional pattern into the world-pattern. The experience you have is of the entire world-pattern. The apparent level of the intention in experience will depend on the world-pattern. Like Moire fringe patterning, the intentional pattern may apparently break through into sensory experience later as patterns align or open gaps:

Reused Owl & Screen Metaphor

You draw a picture of an owl on your TV screen. It is always there, but its visibility depends upon the rest of the imagery onscreen. When the dark scenes of the TV show switch to a bright white scene, suddenly the owl "appears" - it is "manifested". Now imagine an owl *idea* being dissolved "holographically" in the space around you, and replace the notion of dark/white scene with appropriate contexts. Having "drawn" the owl into the space, you go about your day.

Mostly the owl isn't anywhere to be seen, but wherever an appropriate context arises then aspects of the owl idea shine through and are manifest: A man has an owl image on a t-shirt, the woman in the shop has massive eyes and eyebrows like feathers, a friend sends you an email about a lecture at the zoo highlighting the owl

enclosure, a newspaper review of *Blade Runner* talks extensively about the mechanical owl in the interrogation scene, and so on.

[...]

Prelude

On dreaming, I think it's perfectly possible to have any experience whatsoever. Your disposition to be male is not a restriction, for instance. Nor do you have to experience a dimensional space, and so on. The threads between individual world-experiences can be narrow, and in reduced connections between patterns can make it difficult to navigate in memory between on and the other associatively. However, there is only one overall pattern and one felt-sense, because there is only one consciousness in which it all resides. The water sloshes "on its own" in the same way that if you set your arm swinging then (in the absence of friction) it would swing "on its own" from that point onwards, in experience. The experience would *apparently* oscillate (sensory: "arm movement") however the pattern itself would be static (dimensionless facts: "limit angle=45 degrees; period=2 seconds"). I do *not* associate intent with effort or bursts! How many times have I said "no effort is involved"? The shifting of a state or the incorporation of a pattern is a frictionless self-shifting which happens beyond time. There is no inertia.

Habits & Cravings

To me, habits are simply established patterns which contribute to experience. So in this regard, indeed your "maleness" may be a deeper pattern which tends to dominate your experience. Would you call "humaning" addictive, or merely *established*? You description of *next-step* world-making, I agree with broadly speaking. When I talk of a "world-pattern" or similar, I exactly mean these established structures. Long ago (so to speak) these were shallow and malleable, but over time they have become more established. Some we recognise as obvious aspects of experience, others are more like "contexts" or "based formatting" - time and space themselves are such, as are shapes and colours, and so on.

Later, we have "people" and the like. The established structures deepen and form the basis for yet more complexity. The "humanness" of experience *is* this formatting. The body itself isn't a part of this, but the sensory division of "a world" definitely is. The world, the patterning or formatting of experience, is all in consciousness (what you call "the mind" but annoyingly for me that always suggests a container of some sort). A private memory-block of experience that we explore and evolve by that exploration. Observations implying facts implying observations, etc.

Intending is Easy - But

When I say that intending patterns is easy, I mean that the actual doing of it (excuse language) is easy. There's not trick to it as such. The trick is to choosing *exactly what you want to happen* so that pre-existing patterns don't result in, um, undesirable experiences. If you have deeply established habits (like being 38C) you're going to need to hold that pattern for quite a while and diminish the restriction. Unfortunately, breaking the habits that constitute the body might involve it dissolving before you get to your target.

You're gonna need to re-conceive your body first, perhaps, as - say - a floating image with no content whatsoever. Tedious. Yeah so - as you say - insane.

> Q: So those habits don't belong to the world, but to you. You aren't a feature of the world. The world, as it appears, is a feature of your private state, but your state isn't capable of change willy nilly. There are entrenched aspects that will not readily change until you work on them.

Completely agreed. Except that I'd say the habits are in the world and the world belongs to you. The "world" is the entire experiential environment which includes your body and all that also. All of which constitutes the private universe in you!

Don't think we need the "mindstreams" concept, do we?

[...]

> Q: So where would you fit intention into this? Hand that initially splashes the water?

Since the water is you *and* your experience, "intending" would be when you intervene to deliberately reshape yourself to a greater or lesser extent. The waves then continue sloshing, consistent with the amendment made, as if it were always that way. For instance, if you "reshaped" the waves such that a past event or fact was erased (by which I mean, a persistent aspect of the pattern which is influencing the current sloshing) then from that point onwards it would never have existed; there would be no trace of the former state.

If you were to completely calm the water, you would be restarting experience from scratch, a new universe emerging from minor random background fluctuations. So in this metaphor, the *surface* of the water is consciousness - and there is nothing else except for that surface (no depth to the water below and no extent to the surface above). And we can see that there is no definite permanent "past" or "memory" of any previous state of the surface as a whole, because we can choose to deliberately amend or delete any residual patterns (echo ripples) from existence, via intention.

On terminology: "intending" is the *act* of imposing a pattern onto consciousness; "the intention" is the *form* of the pattern being imposed. If you say "my intention is..." you are saying "the pattern I am imposing is..."

I suggest maybe: The background of consciousness is never completely empty of patterns. It is eternal. So in fact, all patterns are present and "dissolved into awareness" awaiting triggering. Babies aren't "new things" they are "new experiences", however the patterns which become layered and emergent for those experiences have always been there.

A "first person" account of not-existing?

Obviously, "first person" is in quotes as a way to indicate that the idea of there being a perspective (1st or 3rd) or a person (localised view) are meaningless during those experiences. Reading the account, you can see how language just doesn't capture these experiences without being misleading.

On existence: Well, that's a blurry concept. Everything could be said to "exist" as potential [experiences], although most people think of "exist" as being actually sensorily perceived, but by that definition when we stop looking at something and things fade into the background, they are not "existing" anymore. The whole concept is a poor one. Better to talk about relative intensities in experience or something.

Perspective implies a here and a there. When all distinctions fall away, what is there to have a perspective on?

> Q (Nefandi): Perspective implies that there are alternative ways of experiencing to what's happening now.

In this context (which is about 1st-person, 3rd person, and so on), "perspective" exactly does mean location and distinction.

> Q: When all distinctions fall away, how do you distinguish lack of distinctions from their presence?

What would you need to do any distinguishing? The experience itself just "is". That's a problem, an artefact of language, of the subsequent description, not of experience. I don't think you actually read the account, or you wouldn't be saying these... ill-informed things. You are trapped by your own words, Nefandi, forever *distinguished* from the truth.

> [**Nefandi**: “That's a problem, an artefact of language, of the subsequent description, not of experience.”; You're confused. Experience *is* language. Language is not something different from and alien to experience. All experiencing is symbolic. All experiencing exercises a mind's faculty of discernment in one or another way. All experiencing is perspectival.
>
> “I don't think you actually read the account”; I have. I like the account, but hate the title you saddled it with.]

This is not really true. Language *is* an experience and symbols *are* an experience. But experience is *not* language. (That would limit us to division.)

Anyway - the point is that language cannot describe the linked experience, because it is *before* division and relation. To think about something, to talk of it with language, it must be cut up into parts, and those parts related to one another (in mental space, so to speak). All of which occurs, *within* consciousness. When all of that fades away, those distinctions vanish. Until you try to think about it of course, in which case you immediately introduce a split. This is one of the points made in the account.

You can't really describe an experience, you can only set up a parallel experience at the same level, and declare one equivalent to another.

> [**Nefandi**: That's because language cannot describe anything. Words cannot even describe other words. If you read thesaurus definitions, they don't actually describe anything. All definitions are circular and they all assume you already sort-of know what's going on. If you don't know what's going on, a thesaurus can't help you at all. The role of language is not to describe, but to structure. Does experience have structure? Of course. Is mystical the same as mundane? No, it isn't. Is language the same as non-language? No, it isn't. That's structure. That's the discriminating faculty at work. That's language.]

Then you don't mean language, you simply mean distinction and reference. Saying everything is language is like saying everything is meaning - it's just abstracting away until there's nothing being said. You don't escape from discrimination by analysing it; you simply cease to attend to it. Otherwise (as you indicate) you keep getting apparent further divisions - albeit in thought.

Let's get back to it: if all content faded out now, would you still be a perspective?

> [**Nefandi**: I'll put it in a way you can understand George. Characters are symbolic, but what about space around, inside, and between characters? If you don't think space is symbolic, then mentally remove the space around and inside the characters, and what happens? Do you still have recognizable characters? Is letter "a" still the same letter if it has no outline that separates the inked part of the letter from the background canvas? If words are symbolic, everything is.]

Oh really. What is space a symbol *of*?

> > Q: Let's get back to it: if all content faded out now, would you still be a perspective? Of course I would be. I'd recognize there is no content because I know what content looks like and this isn't it. This would be a perspective.

I don't underestimate you, but I *do* think you mix up your uses. You are using "symbol" incorrectly here. The space inside your body is *not* a symbol for conventional identity and privacy, it may be *associated* with those concepts, and an illustration depicting a body-space may be used to *represent* those concepts in certain contexts. I think there is a better way to say what you are trying to convey.

> > Q: “Let's get back to it: if all content faded out now, would you still be a perspective?”;
> > Of course I would be. I'd recognize there is no content because I know what content
> > looks like and this isn't it. This would be a perspective.

As soon as you did that, as soon as the recognition (the thought of your experience) appeared, you would indeed become a perspective again. As soon as you think about it or try to describe it or reflect upon it in any way, you stop being it. I maintain that if content faded you are not a perspective, or indeed anything. You have ceased to "take on the shape of" an experience, and simply "are".

> > Q: You think symbols have own-meaning apart from space.

No. You are confusing two things: that space defines non-space (fine) and vice versa - and the meaning of the letter, it's association, it's mental pattern-triggering.

> Q: But how would you know it appeared? You'd have to recognize the old state as though it were distinct from the new.

No, there's no recognition, there is simply *being*. Recognition would break this, introduce relation. It's not even a "state" because it is before states, although the limitations of language mean we must label it like this or similarly. It actually cannot be talked about. If you really don't understand this, then you don't understand the basis of oneirosophy.

Symbolic means representation, one thing points to another. You mean something more like "implies" or "is of a piece with". I also think you are mangling the use of the word "meaning". Are you mixing one type of experience with another, perhaps?

[...]

Let's start, if way may, with a metaphor and then build to symbols and polarity and so on.

Desk, Paper, Origami, Fun

There's a piece of paper on my desk. I take my pen and try to draw a representation of the piece of paper, on the paper.

- What shape can I draw which will accurately do this?

Now the piece of paper itself has awareness. It tries to form a representation of itself in an attempt to experience itself. It tries to do this by folding itself, origami-style.

- What shape can it adopt that will actually do this?

Now, the piece of paper arbitrarily designates its left half as "internal" and its right half as "external". The right hand side had formed into a bump:

- Is that right-hand bump a symbol?
- Does it have inherent meaning?
- Is it *symbolic of* anything?

If the paper forms its left half into a bump and declares it to be representative of the right-hand bump:

- Is the left-hand bump symbolic of the right-hand bump?
- Does the meaning of the right-hand bump change?
- Does the left-hand bump have an inherent meaning?

[...]

> Q: Yup, but remember metaphors have limitations.

Well, quite. That was the point. That's where the metaphor becomes quite "meta" because it itself illustrates the problem with metaphors because that's what it is "about".

> Q: So the best way to represent itself is not to fold, but to remain flat.

Exactly. Or to be clearer: the paper finds that it *cannot represent itself* and to accurately capture itself it can only relax and *be itself*. That is the situation we find ourselves in when we try to talk about this non-experience experience (or whatever we want to call it).

We are not "like" anything.

Of course, the metaphor isn't intended to capture what we "are" (for this cannot be done) but to illustrate the futility of something trying to describe itself by using itself, or even describing part of itself using another part of itself.

> Q: If you relax you won't find yourself nor will you be most like yourself.

Well, there's nothing to find. If you were to completely relax then even the "presence" thing would be gone (whatever we want to call it). If all activation went completely...

> Q: There kind of is something to find.

"Nothing" in the sense that you tend to find what you are not, if that makes sense. As you explore, you associatively discover more and more things that you "become". You find more experiences by looking; you find more shapes but you don't find the "paper" as it were.

> Q: Ordinary relaxation simply reinforces pre-existing habits.

Well, relaxation means ceasing triggering but that doesn't undo what has been done; detachment allows the current thread to fade out completely, potentially, but if you don't assert anything different then you just re-trigger the same patterns into experience again. Of course, you *could* always just start a fresh thread from a new "seed" thought and let it become 3D-immersive.

I'd say that relaxation (ceasing to trigger) lets things settle to their current stable state and can offer some clarity depending on what sort of patterns you've been engaging thus far. Some people are lucky and they get an experience which reveals to them that, wait a minute, I'm not a body in a world, etc. Others, it's too noisy and the feeling of boundary as become too established.

In any case, at some point faith is required. If you want to adopt a new state, you have to *become* it, you have to "take on the shape of" that new state. This is the *active-assertive* approach rather than the passive or investigative approach. You stop waiting or tinkering with what seems to be there, and just go for it. Since anything that changes, you cannot truly be fundamentally, then that is a good way to see, the nature of thee.

> Q: It's not mechanical in the way you describe.

I think **it *is* mechanical though** - in the sense of being "stupid and basic", happening independent of context. In the sense that to change the balance on your sound system, you don't need to worry about which band is playing which song. The world has no depth and consists of inter-triggering patterns. It is has no intelligence apart from its creators. You don't necessarily need to solve *Columbo*'s case before you can switch channel to watch *Mr Robot*.

> Q: So it's always the best strategy to assume the best and instantly go for the target state. You'll either succeed instantly or you'll learn what blocks the path by bumping up against the blockage.

A great point. It can be tempting to try to work out the state and solve it advance but - as our little metaphor form earlier shows - that "working out" is a parallel pattern and resolving it does not necessarily translate to resolving your state. Instead, it's best to simply *assert* the final state as your immersive experience, and immediately you'll get a response. Now, you don't necessarily need to *deal* with that response as such, but you need to accept it and incorporate it rather than avoid it or try to circumvent it.

> Q: [On "stupid and basic"] Relaxation is contextualized by your dominant narrative, habits, hopes and fears, etc.

I wasn't being specific to relaxation there, actually. This was about not having to deal with the details of something before asserting something else. Your narrative, habits, hopes and fears don't matter at all, unless you decide to wrestle with them. Let them go; there's nothing behind them. *Assert*, and your apparent world will blindly shift to the target state. (I'm not guaranteeing this will be a pleasant experience, however.)

> Q: Oh, no. You still need to work out your target state. You need to be able to envision your goal. If you don't know what the goal looks like, feels like, and intellects like.

That's not "working out". If you don't know what your goal looks-feels-intellects like, then you don't actually have a goal at all. To some extent this is what I mean about the "basic" nature of things. If you know what you want? Draw it in detail in the space of "your" consciousness. A result is guaranteed. However, any details you don't supply will be filled in by implication, so it pays to fully render the state.

> Q: So if you know you don't want the present state, but you can't envision a better state, you have to do what?

Then you'll roll along on your present logical trajectory. Fortunately, you can always conceive of a better state, and explore it fully. It does not need to be connected to the present one; in fact one should not seek the connection.

We skip all that, surely? If you can imagine a moment you'd like to experience, that's all you need. You can explore the detail of that, great. It's hardly a challenge. Naturally, one must be aware of these ideas to bother doing so. But that's true of anything, so surely we aren't talking about the random citizen who does not yet understand that there is no depth, and he has power over his situation?

You don't even need to imagine it as an immediate and readily available option. It's a dumb, automatic mechanism. In fact, working it out gets in the way - that's why faith pays. Do the thing and you'll get the thing.

No, it's got nothing to do with "fake". I use the word "parallel" to indicate they are of equal standing, it's simply that one *is not* the other and that needs to be borne in mind. There is no equivalence.

Fake and parallel have quite different meaning, especially in this context, and especially when I was referring to a metaphor which explicitly supplies a context for what parallel patterns would be.

It's you who have suggested that some patterns are "fake". So I should ask: fake in what sense?

Obviously the worst problem is confusing a conception as "what you are". However, the daily issue is that you end up operating on the parallel rather than asserting directly. For instance, we might work out a theory about our bodies and how to cure certain problems thinking that this will resolve our difficulties. However, what's

happening is that we are exploring a *story about* our problems which is independent of our actual symptoms - unless we are fortunate enough to have declared explicit equivalence (which is pretty rare; basically magickal assertion).

The other more pertinent issue is something we see all around us today: people working through fictional descriptions of mind, brain and consciousness trying to solve things and derive insights from patterns which do not exist other than abstractions. In general the issue is: People are dealing with patterns *parallel* to the world-pattern, and are not affecting or interacting with that.

Anything that is not a direct experience is a story about experience (itself an experience). The trick is to know whether you are interacting with the world or a story about the world. It's the difference between actual change and fantasy about change.

Obviously any *discussion* about these things is a story, a narrative. That's language for ya. But so long as the participants understand what is being pointed at, all is well. (The problem is the confusion or assumed equivalence, not the presence of parallel patterning in and of itself.)

All experience is a direct experience *of what it is*. The error is to mistake one thought-stream for another. The "world thought" just *is*. The parallel thought just *is* too - except if it becomes a thought *about* the world and take it as equivalent, and *then* you've got a story.

If you understand what is happening, that's fine. Then you won't mistake operating on one stream with operating on another. The story of our times is the reification of abstraction, the confusion between streams - e.g. taking scientific concepts as "factual" in the same way as world-experiences are inherently factual. Confusing "aboutness" with immediacy.

Two phenomena are always different. That is clear.

Hint: it's to do with the use of the word "two"...

/r/DimensionalJumping

The Buddha Makes A Jump

From an article over at *Science and Nonduality* -

> We may read about the “emptiness” of reality and be perplexed by what this means from a conventional perspective. However, in the context of an interdependent co-arising universe, the fullness of one moment vanishes completely only to be replaced by the fullness of the next instant of manifestation. All that existed in the preceding moment disappears completely so all things are truly empty of an enduring, physical existence. This is a subtle and foundational insight for a wise relationship with the complete dynamism of reality.
>
> --*The Buddha Awakening*, Science and Nonduality

Okay, this is a bit of a different angle, but if you are interested in such things then Buddhism has quite a nice description of how "reality" dissolves and is recreated every moment. This provides a way of thinking how dramatic changes can occur in your experience almost instantly: the continuity of experience is something that *you* do; it's not a property of the universe itself necessarily. By letting go of that continuity, with an intention in mind, we can jump more directly to our desired situation than would otherwise be possible using a "stepwise" approach. Recommend reading the article in full for the quotes, if this is your kinda thing.

Relevant Experiment: Facts Are Now

Facts Are Now (Choose Your Observations Wisely)

Redditor /u/UniversalChairs has submitted a post elsewhere linking to a recent study of the Wheeler Delayed Choice experiment:

> [[OP: **[THEORY] Scientists able to make the present determine the past**.
>
> A pair of physicists recently performed an updated version of John Wheeler's famous Delayed Choice experiment, this time with a helium atom. To put it very simply, a particle (in this case an atom that has the physical properties of weight and mass) can behave either as a discrete particle or as a wave. We've known this particle/wave duality for some time. But this experiment proves that whether the atom behaved as either a particle or a wave can be decided after the fact. In this version of the test, physicists were able to add a second gate that would force the particle to behave as a wave, even after the particle had already passed through the detector. According to one of the physicists involved in the experiment, Associate Professor Andrew Truscott from the ANU Research School of Physics and Engineering, "At the quantum level, reality does not exist if you are not looking at it."
>
> Now, that statement looks good in a headline but it's easily misinterpreted.
>
> /u/FascistAsparagus offers a clearer (although longer) set of possible implications:
>
> We must now accept at least one of the following statements:
>
> 1. The atom was a particle in one universe, and a wave in another. All possible outcomes occur, but we only live in one universe, so looking back, we always see a past that makes sense.
> 2. The atom was both a particle and a wave. Two contradictory things were true at the same time, until we looked at the atom, at which point one reality collapsed, and one remained as the "truth."
> 3. Information about future decisions travelled backward to inform the atom whether there would be a second gate, allowing the atom to decide whether to be a particle or a wave.
> 4. The atom never passed through the gate at all, until we looked to see whether it did. Events don't actually occur in time. History is spontaneously created backward when we check to see if it's there. If we didn't ask any questions, there wouldn't be any answers, because only our conscious choice to examine reality creates reality at all.
>
> For me personally, statement 1 is the most interesting. I've long been an adherent to multiverse theory, but I've only ever conceptualized it from a linear perspective as though every time we make a choice or an observation about something that act determines which of the probable future outcomes we experience. Statement 1 means that we not only determine which future outcome we experience, but which cause in the past resulted in our current present!

> This is a true mindfuck because we're so conditioned to see cause and effect as being fundamentally bound to a linear progression of time, and here we have hard science that's just entirely flipping that notion on its head!]]
>
> > OP: To put it very simply, a particle (in this case an atom that has the physical properties of weight and mass) can behave either as a discrete particle or as a wave ... this experiment proves that whether the atom behaved as either a particle or a wave can be decided *after the fact.*

What it *really* means is that, in effect, the atom didn't behave one way *or* the other at the time. However, the observations you make later decide if reality will behave "as if" it had.

What's the relevance to dimension jumping?

Well, it highlights that what really matters here is *what you experience as true, now*. Directed jumping involves detaching from the current observation while intending, or "asserting", that a new situation is true. Asserting a new fact in this way is like *creating a fake observation*, such that subsequent experiences will be "as if" it were true.

The insight that comes from this: imagined experiences are of the same form as sensory experiences and, if intense enough, have the same weight (create a memory in the universe *as fact*) as sensory experience. See the Imagination Room metaphor as an illustration.

You can read my full take on this in my comment to the main post (it's worth reading the rest of the discussions also):

- - -

Yes, it's a nice experiment, thanks for posting! Some thoughts: I'd suggest the particle-or-wave isn't a wave *or* a particle prior to conducting an observation - rather, "particles" and "waves" *are* observations. Here's a nice snappy article from *Nature* magazine which offers a nice view on this:

> The only reality is mind and observations, but observations are not of things. To see the Universe as it really is, we must abandon our tendency to conceptualize observations as things.
>
> -- *The Mental Universe*, Richard Conn Henry, *Nature*, 7th July 2005

To continue: Talking about things "being this" and "being that" independent of them being observed is an error. Extending this, it does not make sense to talk about "something happening" when it is not being observed. This is because the *facts-of-the-world* do not exist in the same form as we experience them within the senses. Our habit of using our minds to "imagine how things are" and "imagine what happened" is just that - imagination. It amounts to making up little "sensory stories" about the world *as if* they were playing out.

Philosophers like Immanuel Kant had the notion that time and space were, effectively, "basic sensory formatting" of the mind just like shapes, tones, and so on. The world itself, *world-as-it-is*, is not spatially or temporally organised. It is an "infinite gloop" of dimensionless facts - not even! - which doesn't correspond to our conceptualisation, because conceptualisation itself *is* formatting.

This means that you live in a mode of *constant experiencing* which is only organised "as if" there is time and space. Cause and effect don't mean anything:

- **The *only* rule is that the apparent world remains self-consistent as an entire pattern.**

- This means that all observations will be coherent, without regard to apparent distances in time and space.
- Time and space are part of observing, not inherent divisions of the world.

More broadly:

- Things that you aren't observing don't "happen" in a way that corresponds to sensory experiencing.
- Observations are the only things that "happen".

Potential relevance to glitches:

- If a change is made to the (implied) world-pattern, the *whole pattern* will shift to ensure self-consistency.
- There will be no trace of the previous state of the world-pattern after the shift.
- This may not include the observer's memory, which will contain memories of experiences of the former state.
- The observer's memory may therefore fall out of step with the world-pattern.
- Glitches involving a world-pattern shift will leave no physical evidence other than the memory of it.

Final thoughts:

- Therefore in a way what we are truly experiencing is the "formatting" of our own minds.
- We might view this "formatting" as the memories of previous observations + their implications.
- Experiences leave traces which *in-form* subsequent experiences...

[...]

> [Q (BlahBlahBlasphemee): If you approach this from a scientific materialism pov- consciousness is caused by the brain- If the universe keeps branching, creating copies of me, and copies of my brain, then I should be conscious of myself in all those universes that I'm still alive in. But I'm not- for some reason, my consciousness chose one of many paths, why? How? If we take a non-materialistic view and consciousness arises from the soul, not the brain- then the soul chose one of those many paths. So then in the rest of the universes I'm soulless, therefore have no consciousness? If not, then what? A different soul enters my body in those worlds? It doesn't matter if you take a materialist or non-materialist approach, the multiworld theory raises some really difficult and profound questions that don't seem to have answers.]

In both cases you are assuming consciousness is somehow "in" the world and that the world is an actually spatially-extended place, independent of our experiencing of it. If you flip it around, and have sensory experience arise *within* consciousness - and have time and space as the structuring of mind rather than an external structuring, *a la* Kant and others - you avoid all this.

"Many universes" are just "different conscious experiences" aligned to a different set of facts (none of which takes up any space). There are no bodies to be filled: a "body" is just a set of sensations and thoughts, an experience. Meanwhile, given that time is not something that "passes" but is instead an aspect of experience, all possible viewpoints and experiences are in effect active simultaneously.

One consciousness then takes on all experiences at the same "time" - including *being-UniversalChairs* and *being-BlahBlahBlasphemee*.

TL;DR: None of these things is an issue, they come from assuming that time and space are properties of the universe independent of conscious experiencing. Actually, there is just *one* thing. Can't get more Ockam than that... ;-)

[...]

> [Q: This experiment actually involved either adding or taking away the second grating AFTER the atom hit the detector. In different rounds of the experiment, they tried both ways, adding the grate or taking it away. In every case, changing the experiment after the atom hit the detector changed the behavior that the atom exhibited in the past when it passed the detector. That's what's so remarkable about this. It is a delayed-choice-oops-I-changed-my-mind-again experiment.]

But it's important to say that it didn't change the behaviour that the atom *exhibited*, right? That atom didn't have *any* behaviour at the grating/non-grating, because we didn't observe it there at the time it passed. It's important here to distinguish between *inferred* behaviour due to a model or expectation, and *observed* behaviour. The only behaviour *observed* was at the detector. The real takeaway is that our little stories about "particles going on a journey" are just imagination?

> [Q: Yes, that's a good point. The information gained is necessarily after the fact. So when speaking of behavior, it must be "inferred behavior".]

Right. "Behaviour" is a sensory thing, it is the name of an observation. There is no such thing as unobserved behaviour. Imagining something in your mind is not the same as it happening. Imagining that "something happened" but is unknown, is still not the same anything happening. It's not that we don't know what happened. It's that *nothing* happened. Because "happening" is an experience.

It is a dream-world - one that we are dreaming into being, moment-by-moment! Really, I suppose all of this is saying what a clear-minded focus would reveal. If you never fantasised (*thought-about* things) ever again, your experience of the world would be accurate. There is *obviously* no such thing as a past or future. There is *obviously* no such thing as an object or event you have not seen. Those are just "sensory shadows", mere imaginings, overlaid on our actual experience...

Of course, if you didn't think, then you wouldn't be able to enjoy that realisation...

[...]

> >The detector did record some state at the moment that the atom passed it.

No, it didn't record anything at the time. The detector wasn't in any state until it was observed. Nothing "happened" at all until an observation was made. There was no *fact-of-the-matter* until then.

> >The real takeaway here is that information in the past that is unknown in the present is actually not determined at all until an action in the present decides what happened in the past; at which point the past that we get is one consistent with our present.

The essential is right, but you are still describing an unfolding of unobserved events in time surely? The past in this account only exists in the imagination, remember. The connective story is *about* the past, but nothing happened in the past.

If you imagine being the scientist, looking through his eyes, moment by moment - while avoiding imagining anything else going on from a "god's eye" perspective - then those are the only facts-of-the-matter.

> [Q: *'No, it didn't record anything at the time.*'; Well, yeah, you're right. It's more accurate to say that if our expectations of linear time held true, then the detector would have recorded some state at this moment. But because the state is able to be determined at a point in time after the point that the atom should have been at the detector, this seems to show that indeed nothing happened until the outcome was determined and the observation was made.]

Right! It's our *story-making* that is in error, with our assumption that the world is *inherently* spatially-extended and temporally-sequenced, rather than just our experience. I'm really pleased this experiment has been revisited. The original versions lead to the same conclusions, but they have become lost in time (excuse!) such that discussing them seems like 1950's philosophical curios rather than genuinely serious.

> >I've always been drawn to that idea for as long as I've known about the 2 gate test.

Quite! That and David Bohm's approach - the implicate order and so on - pretty much got me on this. In effect, we are dealing with a situation where - although only a small part of it is unfolded into the senses - the entire timeline of world is always present and available for revision, limited only by the restriction that it must "make sense" as a whole. Which leads us to ask: isn't that restriction just something that *we* impose?

[...]

You can't fool it. No matter what you do, the result remains self-consistent. Lots of variations have been tried. It's as if once an observation is made, the larger "implied pattern" of which that observation is a part, becomes fact. It doesn't matter which part of that pattern you trigger or when - once you've done so, the larger "fact" becomes the situation.

Extra bit: One might wonder - are there methods to artificially give ourselves the experience of "something being true", such that subsequent observations are consistent with that experience...?

> >Perhaps placebos are more than mind over matter. Maybe they are mind over reality?

Nice idea! There have been experiments like that before. In fact, there have been lots of pretty thorough "psi" type studies but they don't get any traction. Interestingly, enthusiasm seems to play a large role - beating the statistics towards the beginning and end of sessions (getting bored in the middle). I would take this a step further though. "Fooling ourself" seems like a weak version of such an effect - especially belief isn't causal, but rather a filtering of what you might attempt to do. (i.e. It's *intention* which brings about change, and believing something simply means you are more likely to go all-out with intending it.)

Instead, it would be more interesting to see if we could "assert new facts" deliberately.

Perhaps **mind == reality**, and so *all* cases of cause and effect are, in effect, expectation or habit (i.e. residual intention) by someone, singly or collectively...? (Aside: And we might ponder what "collectively" would actually mean. If there were contrasting intentions, would we be competing or would we simply have divergent experiences.)

> Those psi experiments are cool, but to me they always seemed too experimentally "soft" for the mainstream to take them seriously.

Yeah. Actually, it works the other way than you might think: anything that isn't "soft" is very hard to get a mainstream study going in. You're right: the telepathic vs reality effect is difficult, as is the causing vs predicting thing in general. I'm not very interested in psi research work actually, of this type. Just experimenting with generating synchronicity and so on, it is easy enough to prove to yourself that there is a flexible aspect. The official recognition that "stuff goes on" is nice. But there are also inherent limits maybe, due to the way experiences are formed.

> If we want to assert new facts, it seems like these are the two inhibitors that need to be overcome.

I think those two things are very present. Children often *are* intention machines actually - environment responds to their moods; strange experiences. Some stories also indicate a problem...

And that problem is that the "world-sharing" model doesn't appear to be a simple one. If you have an "extreme intention" it may just be that you stop sharing your environment with those who would not want to experience the results. I don't mean by that that people disappear, more that you are sharing your reality experience with the versions of "extended people" that overlap with your own formatting.

Make a dramatic change, and you've shifted the "world-pattern" to what you want, but only *you* have a memory of the previous state.

> Btw, I was thinking that maybe that's how "magick" works.

Yes, I think it *exactly* works via plausible mechanism. There is no *actual* mechanism, but adopting a "second cause" (an apparent technique or method, combined with a shared worldview for confidence) allows an "as if" mechanism. More precisely, I think that magick and indeed the everyday world works by what we might call "Active Metaphors". That the conceptual model you have adopted = the formatting of your mind = the formatting of your experience. Change your formatting, change your experience.

Common metaphors = common, shared, everyday experience. Unusual metaphors = unusual experience. Deliberately utilising this would be the deliberate practice of magick. I've actually played with this quite a lot. It comes as a direct offshoot of contemplating the structuring of the mind really. Synchronicity, imagination, direct intention, willing. Variations on the theme of perception.

> Want to try it?

What do you have "in mind"? :-)

> Just this Saturday, I tried to "intentionally" find a frisbee to play frisbee golf at the park.

Yeah, that's how it kind of works mostly. I don't think it's restricted to that though. The takeaway from the OP experiment is: "The *only* rule is that the world-pattern must remain consistent overall".

However in this area we push into new territory: About how observations may arise, and if observations have to be permanently "true", and what keeps prior observations being apparently "true". If all that's required is that the world-pattern remains consistent, we can make potentially make any changes we like so long as the world continues to "make sense".

And surely "making sense" is a property of the mind, not of an external universe. In other words, if an observation is a sensory experience and there is no "solid world" behind them, perhaps the only making that observation continue to be "true" and have an effect on future observations, is *us*...

> >I'm just wondering how far this goes. People often talk of Steve Jobs as having had a "reality distortion field". Maybe he did in fact have one.

Steve Jobs exactly was into this sort of thing. If you read his biography, his history is along those sort of lines. Not "magickal" but more a muddle of Zen and intention. However, I also think he never really understood it, it was based more on a sort of narcissistic arrogance, self-delusion and lack of awareness. He sometimes *believed* rather than *knew*. He did after all die of thinking he could cure pancreatic cancer via a diet (a diet which he'd been on, and is linked with pancreatic troubles). In other words, sometimes he use "force of will", but other times he resorted to "second cause".

> >Actually, now that I think about it, the possibility of this stuff does scare me somewhat. I'm not really sure why...

Perhaps it's because, if you can change anything, and anything includes your experience of *being-a-person*, then you realise there is nowhere to stand that is stable (it seems) - and you can only be the background context in which experiences arise. If it's true that the only rule is "the world-pattern must remain coherent overall", then you can completely remake the world right now. Just declare prior observations arbitrary, and being again with a fresh observation this moment. But what does that mean for all that you have (apparently) been and experienced thus far?

Perhaps the experience of Narada can cast some light upon the matter:

> [[**Narada, Vishnu and Maya**
>
> In *Devi Bhagwata Purana*, it is mentioned that once Narada asked Vishnu about the secret nature of Maya (Illusion).
>
> “What is Maya?” asked Narada.
>
> “The world is my Maya. He who accepts this, realizes me,” said Vishnu.
>
> “Before I explain, will you fetch me some water?” requested the Lord pointing to a river.
>
> Narada did as he was told. But on his way back, he saw a beautiful woman. Smitten by her beauty, he begged the woman to marry him. She agreed.
>
> Narada built a house for his wife on the banks of the river. She bore him many children. Loved by his wife, adored by his sons and daughters, Narada forgot all about his mission to fetch water for Vishnu.
>
> In time, Narada’s children had children of their own. Surrounded by his grandchildren, Narada felt happy and secure. Nothing could go wrong.
>
> Suddenly, dark clouds enveloped the sky. There was thunder, lightning, and rain. The river overflowed, broke its banks and washed away Narada’s house, drowning everyone he loved, everything he possessed. Narada himself was swept away by the river.

> “Help, help. Somebody please help me,” he cried. Vishnu immediately stretched out his hand and pulled Narada out of the water.
>
> Back in Vaikuntha, Vishnu asked, “Where is my water?”
>
> “How can you be so remorseless? How can you ask me for water when I have lost my entire family?”
>
> Vishnu smiled. “Calm down, Narada. Tell me, where did your family come from? From Me. I am the only reality, the only entity in the cosmos that is eternal and unchanging. Everything else is an illusion – a mirage, constantly slipping out of one’s grasp.”
>
> “You, my greatest devotee, knew that. Yet, enchanted by the pleasures of worldly life, you forgot all about me. You deluded yourself into believing that your world and your life were all that mattered and nothing else was of any consequence. As per your perspective, the material world was infallible, invulnerable, perfect. That is Maya.”
>
> Thus Vishnu dispelled Narada’s illusion, bringing him back to the realm of reality and making him comprehend the power of Maya over man.]]

Thought experiment: What if your girlfriend (or whatever) had blonde hair and you'd prefer brunette. What if you could just *intend* and change that "fact" now. Would you? If not why not?

Okay, what if instead you could *intend* and then *events would unfold* such that she changed her hair colour (spontaneously deciding to dye it). Would you? If so, why would that be better? Just because there's a little "story" between what you did and how the result seemed to happen? Interesting things to ponder, and examine your actual response.

> [Q (Scroon): When a death event occurs, if our awareness is so opposed to death at that moment...]

Yes. I think there is *always* a next-moment. That next-moment might be that the crash didn't happen, or that you survived miraculously, or maybe you experience "dying and leaving your body and going somewhere else", or even just losing all memory and being reborn. *But*... there's always *more dream* no matter what. So, the next-moment as defined by a mix of plausibility and pattern momentum, perhaps?

> > Talking about altering facts, it could be possible that some larger scale fact-altering experiment has already been conducted...

Could be. There does seem to be a lot of fluctuating. I think it's a mix of there being shared updates, and there not being a single shared world really. Something more like multiple *personal* dreams with overlaps which come and go. In other words, the "consciousness" that is experiencing *being-Scroon* and the "consciousness" that is experiencing *being-George* overlap (are both looking out into the same space) so long as we are aligned. We share some "trajectory" together. Our dream-space becomes common and entangled for a while.

However, if I intend something that is completely contrary to your intentions, our worlds may disentangle, and the "Scroon" in my experience won't have "you" looking through it anymore.

If we really go crazy with reality manipulation, perhaps we end up completely alone in our world - with nobody else sharing the experiencing, nobody else looking through the perspective of the other people. The more "God-like" I try to become, the more that might be the case, since nobody else would want to have the experience of being the other people in my life... Deity is a dirty, lonely business!

> >Hey, perhaps that's part of the fear of taking over the world through intention. It's a subconscious knowledge that you can manipulate other people, but then they cease to be awarenesses and function simply as behvioral automatons.

It is part of it - but remember that unless (and even if) you directly manipulate them, they are not automatons, they are completely human and going along their own trajectory as characters in your dream. And even then...

This is the case anyway. Even if you're not doing it consciously, the aspect of other people you are experiencing corresponds to the state of your mind. In fact, *are* the state of your mind - since the content of your mind *is* your experiences, and that takes in perceptions, sensations, thoughts: *all* experiential objects and events. You are exploring the state of your own mind whether you like it or not. Deliberately changing the state of your mind is just you unfolding *consciously* rather than accidentally. Until now, you just didn't know what you were doing anyway...

Changing this "external" stuff by *willing* is no different to moving your arms and legs. It's all you. And as you wouldn't bend your arms the wrong way (them being "you"), you wouldn't bend the people you encounter inappropriately (they are "you" too). So ironically, the potential for "powers" comes with it a realisation which means you are *more* compassionate to others in your world, rather than less. The nature of power has this baked in because of its nature!

> >I just had a thought that reality could be like Tinder for patterned experiences.

Tinder: Reality Path Selector Upgrade - great! :-)

> > Yesterday, I was thinking about the nature of individual cells in the body. One cell can alter its environment by expressing signals, yet you wouldn't say that it's necessarily controlling its neighbors. They are all part of the bodily experience, aspects of the same shared system while also in control locally.

Hmm. If you *are* your neighbours though? Or if your neighbours are *your experiences*? Because "you" yourself are an *experience*?

> > Oh man, now my head hurts. :)

Don't you mean... your *experience of a head?* :-)

[...]

Consistent Patterned Reality

> >So by making part of the pattern "concrete" or realizing it, all the other parts of the pattern must necessarily come into reality, in order for reality to remain consistent.

Right, but it's completely automatic, like *autocomplete*.

It's like we accumulate facts and those facts act as a filter or formatting for what can be experience subsequently. A new fact narrows the possible future facts. It's a bit like exploring memories by association (as we've said before). You recall a memory pattern and then you are restricted as to what you can remember from there. The rule is that the next pattern must always "make sense". It must always be *thinkable* from where you have got to so far. If you are in a "moment" where observe that a particle is in a certain state, then you can only move to "next-moments" which make sense, which correspond to a coherent world. For as long as there is ambiguity, though, your "next-moments" are less restricted. So long as you don't know, you have more flexibility.

- **The *facts-of-the-world* are being fixed in real time.**

That's why it's good to focus on *actual experience*. What you imagine about something just doesn't count. (Unless perhaps you imagine it really, really intensely...)

Uncertainty and Unpindownability

> >I was thinking of the uncertainty principle the other day and how interesting it is that reality doesn't seem to want to be pinned down to a single set of physical parameters.

When two things are the same thing but divided across formatting structures - e.g. it has aspects in time and aspects in space, like position and momentum - then we have a problem. It's like trying to see both sides of a coin at the same time. The coin is a single pattern, but because our experiencing is formatted "spatially" then we can't experience both sides at once. It our experiencing had been formatted "spectrally" then perhaps we would be unable to see different colours at once. We make this mistake again and again: seeing "two things" when it is just aspects of "one thing". In the limit, of course, we realise that the universe itself is just "one thing" and the only divisions which exist are the formatting of our minds.

[...]

> > [Q: Literally I've been building a very stable theory on how everything is governed and this just confirmed a big part of my theory. A simple, but extremely plausible example I'll put out is let's say everyone on June 1st had a great day, or close to everyone. There's a chance that a related event (spawned from a simple thought that "snowballed" into existent) can be created that took place 1 year ago to 50 years ago. I definitely have started discovering my profound fascination in our life right now]

Because... there *is* no "50 years ago"? There is just a self-consistent present experience? If a new "fact" was somehow created *now* that implied an event had occurred *50 years ago*, then subsequently all observations would be consistent with that event having occurred 50 years ago. There is no actual history, there is just observation, observation, observation... sometimes an observation is "about" a past event, but there is no actual persistent past event. Only a coherent experience *now*.

> > We don't know what time is, or isn't.

Perhaps the answer is: ***there* isn't.**

Actually that comment should have had some "consider this" type question marks, since it was indeed written as speculation rather than declaration - duly added! However, I'll stand by the idea that "all time is now", that the "past" is embedded into "now", which in effect means time is an aspect of the observation, not of the universe. (Following on from OP.)

I think in matters of time and space, it comes down to personal experimentation. Time and space are the "fundamental formatting" of perception. This is different to the *representation* of time and space in descriptive schemes. Which gives us a problem in terms of studying it "objectively": you can't. Observation and modelling rely on reality being "made of parts" before you can begin, and time and space is what *lets* experience be made of parts (spatial partitioning: objects, temporal partitioning: events). It's basically the same thing as trying to study consciousness.

> >Time and space necessarily existed long before consciousness came on the scene...

I disagree. I definitely don't see how they existed "before consciousness". Particularly since they are concepts derived from subjective experience.

> >...experience exists within an objective framework that is space and time

I'd say that experience might be "formatted" in terms of space and time, but I don't see how experience exists within an "objective" anything. It's important to distinguish between our stories *about* our experience - stories which of course exist only within conscious experience - and the actual nature of experience itself. We can only ever really examine the formatting of our own minds: Our thoughts about our minds, are of course within our minds and therefore subject to its formatting.

We imagine space and time to be pre-existing only because our thoughts are *inherently* structured as "shadow sensory experiences", and so pre-formatted by space and time. We cannot perceive or think our way beyond that formatting, so we incorrectly assume it is inherent to the universe. (Except for the occasional mystical experience, of course.)

The experiment described in OP point exactly in this direction (and it's an old idea in philosophy too: Berkeley, Kant, etc).

> >Okay, I'll accept the only thing we can ever know is our own perception, and we cannot know to what extent that is wrong.

And even: wrong compared to *what, exactly?* We can only compare one experience with another.

> >So, when I refer to the universe, I'm simply talking about the apparent one.

Me too. The universe of human experiences.

> >That apparent universe is composed of quarks, which themselves may be composed of something else.

Well, strictly speaking - and what is at the core of the experiment described in OP - is that the universe isn't composed of quarks as such. Quarks are ideas in effect, just like atoms. They are connective concepts between observations. What you have described - quarks, particles, and so on - is a connective story, a fictional framework. One that operates very nicely in terms of linking particular observations together. It's not "how it really is" though. As any good physicist would tell you: physics is about models which predict observations within their remit, not about truth.

> [the story...] if indeed, anything can be said to that affect at all.

That's probably about right. Nothing much can be said about that. All we can do is come up with a conceptual framework which matches present observations.

> it follows consciousness is an emergent property of space and time, and not the other way around.

Well, it doesn't follow at all. Our scientific work *starts* from observations as a conscious being. That is the primary fact. The whole idea of emergence of consciousness from matter is extremely problematic, and not supported by evidence. Which is why even neuroscientists such as Christof Koch are referring philosophical ideas like panpsychism, and cognitive scientists such as Donald Hoffman theorising about interface theories and conscious realism. Both take consciousness to be a fundamental property of "whatever it is that the universe is made from". In fact, the work of Wheeler (the designer of the OP experiment) leads very much to conclusions of this sort as a solution to the "hard problem of consciousness", as described by David Chalmers:

> Wheeler (1990) has suggested that information is fundamental to the physics of the universe. According to this "it from bit" doctrine, the laws of physics can be cast in terms of information, postulating different states that give rise to different effects without actually saying what those states are. It is only their position in an information space that counts. If so, then information is a natural candidate to also play a role in a fundamental theory of consciousness. We are led to a conception of the world on which information is truly fundamental, and on which it has two basic aspects, corresponding to the physical and the phenomenal features of the world.
>
> --*Facing Up to the Problem of Consciousness*, David Chalmers

To continue...

> >However, that isn't apparent from observation, so we must proceed, especially when dealing with each other, with what is apparent.

We must proceed from what is apparent, but we must bear in mind that what we mean is: "what is apparent to *us*". Without this, results such as the OP experiment become intractable.

> >It is apparent space and time are not only prerequisites for conscious perception, but that they don't require it and certainly existed long before it.

It is more accurate to say that "nothing can be said" about this. I don't think we can say that time and space are prerequisites *for* experience. All we can say is that they are aspects *of* experience. Of *our* experience. When a physics experiment (as above) is obviously operating outwith that formatting, we can say with certainty that it is not a fundamental division in the *world-as-it-is*, it is only a division in *the-world-as-experienced*. If we don't make the distinction, we cannot model these observations.

> >Maybe that isn't true, but maybe the universe is an aliens pre-school project... It doesn't matter, since both are equally likely to be the case, along with an infinite number of other arbitrary assertions.

Hmm. It's only you that is making arbitrary assertions beyond what can be observed. I am strictly within what is observable and making no assertions that go beyond sensory experience and thought - to the extent that I am not willing to confuse the structure of experience with the structure of the universe.

Which is just as well - because if I had done so, the Wheeler Delayed Choice experiment would be not a fascinating reveal of our assumptions, but the breakdown of the universe itself.

Not exactly sure where you were going with the flying, simulation and aliens stuff? Just because there's no solid world beyond conscious observation (as indicated), doesn't mean there is no structure to experience.

After all, that is what we are truly studying: *the regularities of the human experience.*

[...]

Just encountered a good video by my favourite anti-temporalist physicist, Julian Barbour. It's quite physics-heavy for those who haven't studied, but he's a good presenter and you can get quite a lot out of it even if you haven't. Adding it here due to relevance to "present causing the past" type ideas.

> **Timeless Explanation: A New Kind of Causality, Julian Barbour**
>
> *Copernicus Center for Interdisciplinary Studies*
>
> There are serious indications from attempts to create a quantum theory of gravity that time must disappear completely from the description of the quantum universe. This has been known since 1967, when DeWitt discovered the Wheeler-DeWitt equation. I shall argue that this forces us to conceive explanation and causality in an entirely new way. The present can no longer be understood as the consequence of the past. Instead, I shall suggest that one may have to distinguish possible presents on the basis of their intrinsic structure, not on the basis of an assumed temporal ordering. If correct, this could have far-reaching implications. Hitherto, because the present has always been interpreted as the lawful consequence of the past, science has made no attempt to answer 'Why' questions, only 'How' questions. But if there is no past in the traditional sense, we must consider things differently. Thus, if we eliminate time, we may even be able to start asking "Why" questions.
>
> -- Julian Barbour, *16th Kraków Methodological Conference "The Causal Universe", May 17-18, 2012*

\- - -

The key observation I make: **The *only* rule is that the apparent world remains self-consistent as an entire pattern.**

If an "observation" is made, the apparent world will appear consistent with the observation from that point onwards. In this subreddit, we suggest that both sensory experiences and imagined experiences count as "contributing observations", differing only in their intensity.

[...]

For the main takeaways, just read the quotes in the post - but for the experiment, it amounts to (*very* loosely speaking):

- Passing a helium atom through a "switch" and then to a detector.
- The "switch" is such that it can correspond to the helium atom being a wave, or a particle.
- But the switch is randomised *after* the the atom passes through it.

- This means that the "wave or particle?" result depends on the measurement, and not the switch.

In other words, "wave" or "particle" are properties which belong to the *observation* and not the atom.

It's a bit like discovering that the brightness of the sun really is a property of which pair of sunglasses you are wearing, and not the sun itself.

TL;DR: The world *is* your accumulated observations of it. The world itself has no inherent properties.

> >You could possibly send yourself into a hefty delusion if you dissociated successfully and heavily too many times.

I say we are mostly safe because the "world-pattern" remains a unified whole, it's just that tugging too hard on one part obviously involves indirectly shifting the rest of it.

However, whatever you fully intend - **or imply** with your intention - is guaranteed to produce an experience of *some* sort, even if it's just lots of thoughts or a dream about it. You could end up with a half-magical, half mundane experience. After all, *it's perfectly possible to dream that you are insane*. So...

> >Do you think this is why people say not to jump too often or too "far"?

What's important is that you don't intend conflicting things - adopt a single metaphor and stick with it. If you view it as "swapping dimensions through a mirror", stick to that. If you view it as "updating your dream", stick to that. *And then let it go*.

In my opinion, we want to stay with a really streamlined "technical" metaphor that doesn't imply much else. e.g. If you start thinking there are "other you's" that you swap places with, you might imply to yourself that these others really exist and might linger or cause problems, that you might not fully switch, etc. And you will have experiences that are consistent with these thoughts. So keep it simple, keep it focused, don't think about it too much: What you are doing is literally "giving yourself a new observation", one which implies facts of the world via the metaphor.

I've linked this before, but the *Dream Views* article on persistent realms is worth a read, because it illustrates how *creation-by-implication* works (albeit in a more flexible starting environment.)

> > So the Fiction- is as real as we'd make it (ish), this sounds a lot like romance

Well, if I was blueprinting a universe, I'd definitely have a healthy dose of romance built-in!

/r/Glitch_in_the_Matrix

Darkroom Vision & Chef Hats & Dreams

I was reading a blog post on how we represent the world to ourselves - a really great article, here at the *Well of Galabes* blog - and a couple of the comments underneath it seemed relevant to our Glitch explanation efforts so I've included them below. They emphasise how much our experience is at best 'inferred' and at worst 'created'. The comment on the narrative flexibility of dreams is interesting too.

You can imagine both of these appearing in this subreddit in one form or another, as reports.

Darkroom Vision

> "I realized I have a much more dramatic example of the pure subjectivity of perception in my personal experience. It's what I call my "darkroom vision."
>
> When I was in college and taking photography classes, we were provided with a large community darkroom. The safelights were always on in the darkroom, of course, as there were often several people working in it side by side.
>
> One day when I was working, the power went out and the safelights went off. A darkroom with no safelights is truly dark; even with full night vision adjustment human eyes will perceive no light. Those of us who were working in there fumbled our way out to wait for the power and lights to return. After a while it was apparent that power was not coming back anytime soon, and I had left some prints in the fixer bath. So I went back into the darkroom to retrieve those prints and move them to a water wash.
>
> When I got in the darkroom, I realized that I could very faintly see the big table in the middle of the room with all its individual tubs of developer, stop, and fixer. This disturbed me, since a darkroom is supposed to be absolutely dark. I reached for the corner of the table, and when my hand reached it, there was nothing there. The table immediately vanished from my sight. I fumbled around a bit, found the table by feel, and instantly it popped back into view in a new, and "correct" location.
>
> Though this image was faint, it was definitely a visual image, indistinguishable from what I would have seen had there been a very dim light in the room that was just barely above the threshold of perception. But, given the disappearing and reappearing act the table put on, it was also clearly coming from inside my mind, not from any "objective physical reality."
>
> After this experience, I discovered that I can always see by this "darkroom vision" when I am in familiar places in total darkness, but (here is the key) ONLY if it is a place I know well in the light. It is very useful. The image includes things that I do not have a direct conscious memory of. If I have misplaced something, I can look around for it, and when I see it and reach for it, it usually is there. It's funny, when it is not there, to see it vanish. But it is usually not far from where I saw it, and it will pop back in to view when I do get my hand on it. In one darkroom I was even able to read the hands on a large timer clock, getting some idea of how much time was left before it would chime. The reading I saw on the clock was often not exact, but it was fairly close.
>
> And of course the evolutionary biologist in me appreciates what a wonderfully clever adaptation this is, to present all this subconsciously stored information in a handy visual image, showing me all of my

mind's best estimates of the position of everything in the room relative to where it judges me to be. I don't have to think about it at all, it is effortless on my part. I just look around. And it updates instantaneously in real-time based on new data."

-- Bill Pullium, comment

Objects Revise Themselves

"I remember working in a kitchen, when a few of the cooks began to wear tall white paper hats like the chef had always worn. One of these cook's had a similar body-type as the chef, and sometimes when he'd enter the kitchen, from a distance and out the side of eye, in peripheral vision, I would actually "see" the chef enter the room, until he got closer and the image would shift back to the cook in question.

This happened after I had started meditating and noticing the activity of my mind more. I was surprised, because it wasn't just that I was unsure of who this person and thought, "That might be the chef", it was the for a really brief moment, I actually had an image in mind of the chef entering the room, which was quickly altered as the cook came into better focus.

Interesting also in that, from a social primate point-of-view, my mind was always scanning for the chef's presence, and how he might view my work.

I notice that phenomenon in the evening light as well, when I encounter an object that I can't quite make out what it is, but looks to be the size of an animal - it is very quick, but I can see my mind trying on various perceptions to the hazy figure: "Is it an animal? Is it a raccoon, or a dog?" until I can get a better view of the object, and the perception settles down to something more stable.

I imagine these moments of perceptual uncertainty make conscious a process that is normally hidden from me, of how the mind decides what something "is", like a table, or chair, or person, etc., and then supplies an appropriate image, though it seems to me like I am simply "seeing" something that is "there".

Something else - in becoming aware of my dreams, I noticed that my mind has these moments of indecision, then decides on a narrative framework for things, then will alter past happenings to fit that framework. I'd always thought dreams were like movies playing from beginning to end in order, but on closer inspection, it seems more like streams of thinking, in which the mind will decide on a story, then go back and change what happened before to make that story coherent!"

-- Daniel Cowan, comment

We don't just see with our eyes, we see with our whole bodies. Absolutely *all* input acts as a source for our perceptions.

[...]

I'll add another experience which is more accessible, that we've probably all had but perhaps not paid much attention to: When I misread a word, I actually *do experience the wrong word* - I literally see that incorrect word in front of me - and then it 'snaps' to the right word when I go back to check.

This highlights how our experienced world is basically an inferred dream-space where the objects are a best guess, 'inspired' by sensory(?) input and historical context, and is continually updated as new information is received. This brings to mind Donald Hoffman's ideas on our experience being like a 'user interface' to help with our aims in the most efficient way, rather than an accurate representation.

Anything could be going on behind the scenes. What we perceive may be directly related to our aims and goals, as things are filtered accordingly.

> The dream thing really trips me the hell out.

Yep. Basically, each moment strives for 'coherence of narrative'. You're doing it right now. Actually, the process described of "trying on different interpretations" is an example of this. Normally we don't remember this; once the perception has settled, it was "aways that way" for most of us.

We delete any inconvenient histories as we go, once we've reached a decision.

> I've heard about the night vision thing before. A lot of people say that when that happens you're looking through your pineal gland, your third eye. Interestingly the pineal gland actually contains rods and cones like your eyes do.

Yes, I've had the experience of 'seeing through eyelids' and the accompanying feeling is that I'm centred and 'looking out from' somewhere near my prefrontal lobes. This is also a technique used by some vision improvement approaches, interestingly - to "find your centre for seeing".

> it's not really the eye that "sees", it's the brain that interprets the optical signals

You can take it a step further. Your brain doesn't interpret optical signals and turn them into images directly. The signals from your eyes and other organs all just contribute information, to the extent they are available and 'online'. What we actually do is essentially *imagine* our surroundings, based on inputs from the senses and from memories. Not in a "processing way" and not through conscious effort; this is the passive activation of previous patterns. Certainly, if there are little bits of movement detectable those will contribute - but *even in complete darkness* you can still see the room around you when relaxed (and if you allow it to happen), although often it'll be a little bit wrong. (This skill is very handy, because when you look at how eyes work, they are *rubbish* at seeing - you are mostly blind anyway.)

In fact, people who go blind later in life sometimes find that after a while they can "visually perceive" objects around them again, as other senses provide clues from which the presence of those objects can be inferred. In other words, what you apparently see around you right now is a hallucination "inspired by" whatever information is available. Which is why you can still see in dreams, even though you don't have any eyes!

The problem here is with the word "seeing" because in common usage it implies "eyes" or that you are somehow perceiving a thing that is definitely there.

Perhaps it's better to keep it to the essentials: "Seeing" is having the experience of seeing something, whether or not there is a something actually there, in the form of an image.

> Also, I don't believe that one can still "see" in complete darkness

You can. You don't need any light at all to experience a complete room around you (as described in the post). When you try to *act* on the basis of that image, it will update according to the cues provided by touch though

- in the same way everyday seeing is updated by the little snippets of optical information your eyes periodically provide. Or more accurately, the content of *attention* as it scans.

It is a relatively rare experience though, but if you relax enough you can have it. In fact, it might be the natural state of vision if we aren't interfering through effort.

> But this works only once you know an object and/or have seen it before.

You can *only* see things you've seen before (when you see a new object, it is made up of raw shapes and colours, or other familiar elements in an arrangement; it takes a while for it to become its own complete pattern). If you have a misunderstanding of an object, you will "see" that misunderstanding, until a closer look reveals the contrary detail.

It's a fun thing to experiment with.

> Huh? Seeing without having eyes, in a dream? That never happened to me.

Of course you have. I mean, do you think that "dream eyes" take in "dream light" which is then processed in a "dream brain" so you can have some "dream seeing"?

Although your dreams do sound as though they could do with a bit of perking up! ;-)

An interesting observation though: Sometimes we have "knowing" dreams where we aren't actually experiencing. Almost like we're just getting *narrated* the content. And you are usefully highlighting that we don't all have the same experience!

(If you've ever had a lucid dream though, you'll realise that a dream environment can be *more* vivid than everyday life.)

We can get right to it: How can you tell the difference between "full imagination" and *not* "full imagination"? After all, we only know we are "deceived" when our experience *shifts* in a "correction".

I mean, have you really examined every part of the room you are in? And yet, you don't feel as thought there are "gaps" in your visual experience of it. There are most likely vast parts of your daily experience which you have never examined properly - and you are therefore just completely hallucinating, without knowing it.

I think of it as "dreaming, inspired by the senses". Of course, I have no access to the information provided by the senses at all - only the final conclusions - but we tend to assume that what we are experiencing is in some way contributed to by such things.

> If that would be the natural state of vision, it would be better to have no eyes - I just don't believe that.

No, that's not what I mean. I mean that, in a relaxed and open state, it is possible to have a visual experience of your surroundings even with eyes closed. When you go up and down stairs and use your keys with eyes closed, if you pay attention you'll find that you do it via a sort of "three-dimensional feeling-out". There's not much difference between this and a "three-dimensional visioning-out".

> What about babies? Everything is new to them, they don't have names for anything, how could they learn to see?

Why do you think having names for things matters? (It's an interesting assumption!)

Babies learn to see slowly, and it happens passively. There are probably raw "archetypical" or building-blocl shapes which can be perceived immediately (it is thought). Exposure gradually clumps these together into trace patterns. Lines and circles become associated in certain configurations into whole patterns of increasing complexity, into what we term "objects".

Simple exposure over time will result in this pattern formation.

> What I see with dream-eyes is full imagination.

Right, you don't have *functional* dream eyes, do you? You just have the imagination. The dream eyes are *inside* the imagination. Your dream experience isn't "inspired by" the input of dream sensory organs.

> Close your eyes and take it away: With eyes closed you can either image it still being there, or taken away.

A couple of questions to ponder:

- Why don't you go blind (or blurry) every time your eyes move?
- Isn't blinking and eye-shifting essentially closing your eyes?
- How can you tell the difference between a dream experience and a waking experience, apart from by memory and expectation of what is "usual". In other words, what *about the direct perception of the moment* is different?

[Q: I had some dreams where I could take control over what I did]

Yep, if you *knew* you were dreaming while in the dream, that's lucid dreaming. Interesting that you don't have colours! Next time you have such a dream, just "ask" for it to be super-vibrant and in colours. And don't take "no" for an answer! :-)

Interestingly, in the 1950s/60s it was thought that dreams *were* black and white, and people nicely played along by having black and white dreams, and those people didn't believe it was possible to dream in colour because they'd never experienced it. But it was. The same thing happened with lucid dreams.

We Are But The Dream Puppets Of Picard

Now, this is more in the realms of /r/synchronicities but because it's part of a chain of events that relate to this sub, I'm going to post it.

In my downtime over the last month, I've finally been putting a bit of effort into philosophy stuff - reading things I've been meaning to catch up on, overdue film viewings and suchlike - all related to the nature of reality, thinking, perception, imagination, dreams, all that. In among the masses of comments recommending related film and TV to watch, someone recently mentioned an episode of *Star Trek: The Next Generation* that has parallels to one of my favourite stories on this sub. Forgot all about it; was never all that into *Star Trek* and haven't seen it in maybe 10 years. Browsing the web with cable TV on in the background yesterday (not usual, I always watch DVDs or downloads, not broadcast) getting bored of the sound of Ben Miller's voice in *Death in Paradise*, I flick the channel up - *Friends* - and again - *Friends* again - once more - it's *Star Trek: TNG*.

"Hey, I wonder if it's that one about Picard's dream? That would be amazing."

Channel starts, Picard's on the bridge and within a second gets knocked out by some mysterious energy ray. Wait for the end of the opening credits for the episode title. Sure enough, it's *The Inner Light*, the episode all about living a full parallel life in (effectively) a dream, packed with relevant messages. And an annoyingly persistent flute melody.

If this world suddenly evaporates later today, revealing all this to be part of a post-meal nap Patrick Stewart is having, I won't be all that surprised.

TL;DR: I watched TV yesterday. ;-)

[...]

What I love about these experiences is, you can't really identify the start point. There's a complicated process of unlikeliness for everything to line up. One part can't really have "caused" the rest - it's like one complete pattern that must have come into being all at once; it's just that we experience it moment by moment.

Today's Random Theory

there's always one brewing, sorry

When we have a problem to solve, we usually think about the problem and its details, and generally try and "work it out" by effort. Sometimes we get to the answer by doing this, usually we have to stop and let it be. Quite often, the answer then just comes to us, pops into our heads, later. Curious!

There's a book called *Autopilot* by Andrew Smart which talks about how, when you stop consciously directing yourself, your brain is actually at its busiest. (fMRI research often ignores this "background" as distracting, but it's actually your default mode in life, or should be. You are right to be lazy.)

The best way to generate ideas and solutions, in other words, is to set up the problem and then leave it be: all your resources will work on it holistically, and you'll be alerted when this is done. *Trying* to solve it actually interferes with this process: you keep resetting the problem back to its starting point!

I think of this as: A problem isn't *solved* really, not by action - a problem is actually a thought which gradually and naturally unfolds and changes into its own solution. The solution is implied in the problem, or: the only difference between a problem and a solution is *time*.

So, what if the whole world works like this? When you have a 'problem' or a 'question', it's not just your brain that is constantly busy moving from the 'question' to the 'answer' - it's *the whole universe*. Sometimes the answer will come as a thought in your head; sometimes as a television programme; sometimes as an overheard conversation on the street; sometimes as a spontaneous action you end up doing for no reason...

TL;DR: Left alone, the universe naturally moves from the problem to the solution, from the question to the answer. Does your life in fact constantly seek to solve itself, if you let it, by whatever route is available?

It's not really a religious thing, it's more a how-the-world-seems-to-work thing. Those prophet types just got their version in first!

Maybe all religions are based on fundamentally sound ideas about the world (or rather the mind) probably, trying to convey essential truths as seen at the time. The teachings just become corrupted in the service of the "business and power" aspect of mature religious organisations. Even the whole notion of "God" gets mutilated into a vengeful entity, rather than the "nature and inherent intelligence of existence" (your mind as it works if left alone) as originally intended.

The essence: -- "Ask and it shall be given to you; seek and you shall find"

Actually, the alternative translations say it even more clearly. Neville Goddard, a New Thought thinker last century, built a whole approach to life based on interpreting the Bible as a "manual for the nature of reality, the mind, and living". Fascinating stuff.

Set up the pattern or define a problem, let the "universe" unfold and solve it! If that isn't an example of "faith", what is? (I'm not religious at all, I just find these connections interesting.)

[...]

It's possible that none of... *this* was as it now "was". How do we tell whether it is us, our minds, that change - in a moment of epiphany say -or the world? We have a feeling, a tugging, so we investigate further, and find we cannot separate the two.

Repost: A Parallel Life / Awoken By A Lamp

One of my favourite glitches is this one posted by /u/temptotasssoon, who apparently lives an entire life in the moments after a head injury. He eventually awakes from this dream when he notices that something is strange about a lamp.

People are always asking for it, but because it's in a comment rather than a proper post, it's hard to search for. So, I'm reposting it here to give the story its proper place in glitch history...

NOTE - I am not OP. OP's account was a throwaway and the original comment is three years old. So don't expect any question-answering from he or me.

A Parallel Life / Awoken By A Lamp

> *throw away account cause this is really personal.*
>
> My last semester at a certain college I was assulted by a football player for walking where he was trying to drive (note he was 325lbs I was 120lbs), while unconscious on the ground I lived a different life.
>
> I met a wonderful young lady, she made my heart skip and my face red, I pursued her for months and dispatched a few jerk boyfriends before I finally won her over, after two years we got married and almost immediately she bore me a daughter.
>
> I had a great job and my wife didn't have to work outside of the house, when my daughter was two she [my wife] bore me a son. My son was the joy of my life, I would walk into his room every morning before I left for work and doted on him and my daughter.
>
> One day while sitting on the couch I noticed that the perspective of the lamp was odd, like inverted. It was still in 3D but... just.. wrong. (It was a square lamp base, red with gold trim on 4 legs and a white square shade). I was transfixed, I couldn't look away from it. I stayed up all night staring at it, the next morning I didn't go to work, something was just not right about that lamp.
>
> I stopped eating, I left the couch only to use the bathroom at first, soon I stopped that too as I wasn't eating or drinking. I stared at the fucking lamp for 3 days before my wife got really worried, she had someone come and try to talk to me, by this time my cognizance was breaking up and my wife was freaking out. She took the kids to her mother's house just before I had my epiphany.... the lamp is not real.... the house is not real, my wife, my kids... none of that is real... the last 10 years of my life are not fucking real!
>
> The lamp started to grow wider and deeper, it was still inverted dimensions, it took up my entire perspective and all I could see was red, I heard voices, screams, all kinds of weird noises and I became aware of pain.... a fucking shit ton of pain... the first words I said were "I'm missing teeth" and opened my eyes. I was laying on my back on the sidewalk surrounded by people that I didn't know, lots were freaking out, I was completely confused.
>
> At some point a cop scooped me up, dragged/walked me across the sidewalk and grass and threw me face down in the back of a cop car, I was still confused.

I was taken to the hospital by the cop (seems he didn't want to wait for the ambulance to arrive) and give CT scans and shit..

I went through about 3 years of horrid depression, I was grieving the loss of my wife and children and dealing with the knowledge that they never existed, I was scared that I was going insane as I would cry myself to sleep hoping I would see her in my dreams. I never have, but sometimes I see my son, usually just a glimpse out of my peripheral vision, he is perpetually 5 years old and I can never hear what he says.

EDIT (24 hours after post): never though anyone would read this, I changed a line so that it no longer seems that my 2 year old daughter bore a child.

I have never seen Inception or the Star Trek episode so many have mentioned (but I will eventually)

I will not do an AMA

I've had many PM's describing similar experiences and 3 posters stating such experiences are impossible, I'd say more research needs to be done on brain functions. Pre-med students, don't assume you know everything. A few have asked if they can write a book/screen play/stage play/rage comic etcetera, please consider this tale open source and have fun with it

-- /u/temptotosssoon

[META] The "Realness" of Explanations

As we push for explanations which account for the reports submitted to this subreddit, it is natural to try to link them to the current theories of science - specifically, those of physics and quantum mechanics or computing. After all, that is how we go about describing the "observed regularities" of the everyday material world. However, I feel that what often happens is we are hooking an idea onto one of the populist interpretations of QM such as "many worlds", and so on, because it seems to add "the badge of science" to the older explanations in myth or fiction, such as the existence of "other realms", "parallel realities". The QM badge actually obscures things therefore.

The truth is, QM remains an ad hoc mathematical formulation which gives numerical results (it works!) for which there is still no satisfactory understandable description (we don't know what it means!). Even this month's *New Scientist* has yet another article with someone trying a fresh approach based on some new arbitrary axioms.

This isn't really physics though, it's philosophy.

There's a good article in this month's *Scientific American* about the relationship between science and philosophy. From the article:

> [Whereas the clockwork universe has been invalidated by the Heisenberg uncertainty principle of quantum mechanics, quantum mechanics remains devilishly hard to interpret philosophically. Rather than say physics “understands” the universe, it is more accurate to say that the models of physics remain sufficient to describe the material world as we observe it to be with our eyes and instruments.]

A blog post by physicist George Ellis had this to say:

> ‘The belief that all of reality can be fully comprehended in terms of physics and the equations of physics is a fantasy. As pointed out so well by Eddington in his Gifford lectures, they are partial and incomplete representations of physical, biological, psychological, and social reality.’
>
> *Horgan: Are you a fan of multiverse theories? String theory? The anthropic principle?*
>
> ‘No (may be true but unproveable, much too much untestable speculation about existence of infinities of entities, ill defined and untestable probability measures), no (too much speculative introduction of very complex unseeable entities, treats gravity just like any other force), yes (however one responds to it, it’s a real question that deserves consideration). Fine tuning of fundamental physics parameters is required in order that we can exist. Examining this issue has led to many very interesting studies.’

In other words, what we are actually doing when we explain glitches in terms of QM is we're invoking the *imagery* of it ("hey, the equations describe multiple states as if they exist at once, but we only see one of them when we look!"), to do a bit of philosophy or metaphysics. The two takeaways, maybe:

- QM is not an explanation for a glitch, unless maybe the glitch is literally that you've conducted a double-slit or entangled particle experiment. In which case it's a *description* rather than an explanation.

- *But* that doesn't mean we can't use the imagery and wider concepts to come up with stories that fit a glitch report. This won't be "scientific" (no way to do repeatable experiments - yet), but it will be "explanatory fiction" - which is the first step in coming up with a coherent theory for any phenomenon.

Anyway, that's my take at the moment. Interested in your views if you feel energetic enough to wade through all that!

I'll add in this excellent article by John Bell, yes he of "Bell's Theorum" fame. There are a few equations a couple of pages in, but you can just skim them and read the quotes in those paragraphs: *Against Measurement* by John Bell, Physics World August 1990

Some additional background from the Wikipedia entry:

> Bell remained interested in objective 'observer-free' quantum mechanics. He felt that at the most fundamental level, **physical theories ought not to be concerned with observables, but with 'be-ables'**: "The beables of the theory are those elements which might correspond to elements of reality, to things which exist. Their existence does not depend on 'observation'."[25] He remained impressed with Bohm's hidden variables as an example of such a scheme and he attacked the more subjective alternatives such as the Copenhagen interpretation.[26]
>
> Bell died unexpectedly of a cerebral hemorrhage in Geneva in 1990.[27][28][29] Unknown to Bell, that year he had been nominated for a Nobel prize (which is never awarded posthumously). His contribution to the issues raised by EPR was significant. Some regard him as having demonstrated the failure of local realism (local hidden variables). **Bell's own interpretation is that locality itself met its demise.**

[...]

Definitely a strictly classical interpretation is no good. But neither are any of the current quantum mechanical interpretations (assuming they can be meaningfully extended to large scale).

That's why I think we should feel free to explore our own philosophical approach. After all, that's where the current crop of physical theories began. The concept of "atoms" was a philosophical idea long before it became a foundation of science.

This is what's needed today: Fresh concepts which provide a conceptual framework for our observations, which then might lead to more focused study, which then might lead to an expansion of science to incorporate them. Exciting times...

[...]

> > Follow philosophy, not current science?

Current science, for sure, but as it is not as it is fantasised to be. As you say, the 'bleeding edge' is where the interesting things are. In a way, established science can be said to be "hardened philosophy".

Many times we have a comment which amount to "scientists now know" and "the double-slit experiment proves that" as a pat answer, either to assert or dismiss an idea. In some ways, it's become the new "absence seizure!". It's unfortunate because it tends to stop further thinking.

Some people are under the impression that things are understood, that there is an authority position on the matter, when this is not the case. A lot of this comes from the gee-whizz articles in popular publications, which make sweeping claims and predictions, which overstate the case. Some of this is funding promo talk though. (Remember when DNA was a "blueprint for the person" and there was going to be a gene for every characteristic?) This applies to QM, neuroscience and consciousness studies, understanding of perception, all those interesting areas.

So it's worth knowing this - that a bit of a theory being a 'little bit like' something doesn't equate to an explanation of a phenomenon, there's still work to be done. In much the same way as naming and categorising a phenomenon doesn't explain it either.

> The scientific theories have mathematical and sometimes observational evidence to back them up so they may not pan out, but they have a decent shot.

Is "mathematical evidence" actually evidence? Having a self-consistent conceptual model doesn't mean much unless it connects to observational evidence (a problem with both many-worlds and string theory).

Anyway, as far as glitches are concerned we have the problem that their nature means that it's pretty hard to study. They are impossible to anticipate, and most seem to leave no trace except in the memories of the observers. If someone can come up with a way to capture this in some sort of study (beyond anecdote collection), where people cause and observe them, that would be amazing and it could become a scientific area.

My gut feeling is: this can only be proved to yourself, and people who don't want it proved can't have it proved to them. (Experiments with hypnosis often reach this conclusion: people refuse to experience someone disappearing, etc, they instead experience "narrative explanations" for their absence.) Which would be fun to try and test all of its own!

Choosing a particular glitch and working on replicating it might be another approach.

[...]

I'm of course all for using the explanations-of-the-day where applicable, it's just that sometimes we apply them as an automated response, when they really don't apply in that case.

Experiences are always real - what they are "reals" of, though, that's the tricky bit.

/r/lawofattraction

Mind-Formatting: Synchronicity & Imagination

I've been having a couple of discussions elsewhere which might be relevant to this subreddit. I am always on the lookout for better metaphors to describe how the mind, perception, reality, intention work - e.g. the Infinite Grid metaphor for describing a shift from one experience to another.

More recently, following a post about synchronicity:

- Synchronicity as a result of mind-formatting, followed by:
- The metaphor of The Imagination Room

You can probably see how these fit into the LOA scheme. Do you have a particular "way of thinking about things" that helps you understand and use this approach? How has it affected your success?

[...]

> I'm majoring in metaphysics

Ah, nice. Actually, you might find Bernardo Kastrup's website and the related *Metaphysical Speculations* forum of interest. It's a little focused towards straight philosophical idealism perhaps, but sometimes interesting things come up.

> I love the imagination room analogy

Great. It's quite good fun, isn't it? I'm on a bit of a quest for what you might call "practical metaphysics" for describing personal experience, different metaphors that you can *live from*. It's easy to get into *thinking-about* things, without actually really adopting and experiencing them. So with things like The Imagination Room, the idea is that while you go about your day you can bring up that image, and kind of "feel it" in place and experiment.

> Right, applicable metaphysics. Things people can use to improve their lives.

Yes. People can spend a lot of time trying to be "right" and think that will improve things. Actually, they are just being *conceptually right* - building self-consistent thought-castles in the sky. They end up feeling correct, but their lives remain the same. A decent metaphysics for living would actively *shape* lives into a happier form; you would absorb and become it. As Slartibartfast says on the old *Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy* TV series (I assume it's in the more recent film too):

SLARTIBARTFAST

I'd far rather be happy than right any day.

ARTHUR

And are you?

SLARTIBARTFAST

No. That's where it all falls down of course.

Well, **in an applicable metaphysics you'll get both**!

> Indeed. I personally consider the LoA to be both the truth to a lot of questions about existence, as well as the most applicable, hence why I threw myself into it so completely.

Agreed. The only problem with it is, because it's formulated as a list of instructions without a supporting structure, people get confused. They try to make changes in their world while still remaining, themselves, as they were. But - as the room metaphor points out - it's a matter of shifting or imagining *the whole experience*, which includes the person-experience.

Neville Goddard from the New Thought era (*The Law and the Promise*, *Out of this World*, etc) was quite good on this, although his language is a little obscure sometimes for modern tastes. He had both the idea of world-as-imagination, and all-possibiliites-already-exist, but he never really wrote up a single description for it.

My feeling is that people genuinely don't understand the difference between thinking about something, and imagining it from their own perspective. They do the equivalent of creating a little thought bubble containing their wish, looking at it, rather than summoning the experience around them. *No amount of explanation seems to work.*

That's why I've come to think that *spatial* visual metaphors are the best way.

For an example of how hard it is to bring people back to their present, spatial experience, I recommend checking out this conversation between Rick Archer and Rupert Spira. You've got one guy (Archer) who is supposedly interesting in understanding how things are, another guy (Spira) who is leading him to it, and the first guy is constantly wanting to talk *about* it rather than have the experience. Maybe this is because: Most people are slightly dissociated, and coming back to being 1st-person and "embodied" is actually an unpleasant idea? So they wriggle and resist it. LOA and its ilk *all* involve confronting and being yourself fully.

"Absolute allowing" - with that, if one could truly commit to it, everything would be far easier.

> According to Bashar, if one could manage to train their mind well enough and remove all trace of resistance to anything, it's theoretically possible to achieve instant manifestation

Mr Goddard said something similar:

> Divine imagining and human imagining are not two powers at all, rather one. The valid distinction which exists between the seeming two lies not in the substance with which they operate but in the degree of intensity of the operant power itself. Acting at high tension, an imaginal act is an *immediate* objective fact. Keyed low, an imaginal act is realised in a time process. But whether imagination is keyed high or low, it is the "ultimate, essentially non-objective Reality from which objects are poured forth like sudden fancies". No object is independent of imagining on some level or levels. Everything in the world owes its character to imagination on one of its various levels.

-- *The Law and the Promise*, Neville Goddard

Detaching, absolute allowing, effortless intention. The more you become the background in which sensory experience arises, and unidentified with the content of experience, the more you approach the situation where you need simply "Just Decide".

> > You seem very much involved in the world of metaphysics, is that your career as well, or just a hobby?

Hobby really. Always been interested, did the science thing before, into design and communication stuff, but always behind it has been a curiosity of "how things are", how they work, how best to think about them, and where that leads us. It's fun to try and pull all these things together.

The more you look into it and experiment, the more you think there's potentially a very flexible situation. The issue becomes to what extent this is a simply-shared reality, and if you push very far, what happens.

(Interlinked separate dream-worlds so everything is okay, or do we "break"?)

> [Q: "Absolute allowing"; Could you please explain your technique/practice to achieve this? Thanks.]

Simply *decide* to be okay with whatever arises, or doesn't arise. Whatever shifts occur in experience, be fine with it. All your experience is "made from you", so there are no techniques - there are only experiences. All you can do is "just decide" what is going to happen, and then get out of the way and... let it happen. There is no technique to being what you are, or to intending something.

Then: never get in the way again. ;-)

You're very welcome.

Buddha: Nice guy. If you see him, remember and kill him. ;-)

> [Q: “Buddha: Nice guy. If you see him, remember and kill him.”; This is one thing that I'm still trying to understand.]

It just means that you shouldn't get hung up on concepts - whether that's "enlightenment" or "Buddha" or anything else. Your *thinking-about* something is not the *thing-as-experienced*. The *idea* of "oneness", for instance, is a division. And it can't encapsulate what it is within. The concept of "everything" is *inside* the everything it is referring to, etc.

> [A: Everyone's majoring in metaphysics....most people just don't realise it! :)]

[...]

> [Q: I cultivate a view that I live in a kind and loving universe. By accepting that, I accept that deserved or not, good things will happen for me. It allows a lacksidasical certainty of outcome.]

Nice style. The whole notion of "deserving" is an error anyway; unless you imagine that the universe operates on that principle. A true "law" works regardless of whether you've been a good boy or girl or not. The "gratitude" aspect to LOA is, in my opinion, a matter of associative triggering - in much the same way as part of a memory results in auto-completion of the recall (e.g. a smell or texture triggers a memory of a childhood event), feeling good results in filtering down to, and mechanical selection of, feeling-good-type events.

> [Q: Associative triggering: same as smiling to make yourself happy. I think you are quite right, by being grateful, you are implying / accepting the outcome.]

That's a nice example. **LOA: The Amoral Santa Claus**.

/r/occult

Direct, Simple Magick

Has anybody had much experience with trying to simplify their approach right down to the basics - a sort of post-Chaos approach? Although there's much fun to be had chatting to entities and following rituals, is there a way of cutting this to the bone?

Alan Chapman in his book *Advanced Magick for Beginners*:

> "Could this mean that what we use to represent our desire is arbitrary? And what does this say about the sigilisation process, and therefore magick itself? It doesn't stop with glyphs; instead of a geometric doodle, you could use a number, or a combination of numbers. Or how about a word, nonsensical or otherwise? What if we decide that a gesture represents your desire instead, like a wave of the hand? Or some other physical movement, like a dance? What if we decide that a certain dance means it will rain?"

In other words, our acts mean just what we decide they mean, magically speaking. Later, he suggests that altered states are just ways of circumventing doubt or poor intention (e.g. effectively unintentionally requesting "I will want a new car" rather than "I will have a new car") and are not essential. Any experiences?

[...]

Stripping things down and knowing this can be done then means your free to build it all back up again for *pure enjoyment*, knowing that the details are not actually essential. That can be quite freeing?

[...]

> > Q1: I don't get it, magick is so simple and yet people get so caught up. Taking a shit? It's causing change in accordance with will. Last time you got a date? Last time you filled up the gas tank? Last time you ate? Without simple magick you're dead, are you dead? Am I? There's your answer.

Sure, there's a sense in which you and the universe work by magick; it's just 'how it all is'. Your thoughts and actions arise spontaneously in the direction of your implied intentions, and the environment around you tends to conspire and adjust and bend accordingly also.

The point here is that lots of people put a load of *effort* into doing two things:

1. Deciding on what they think they 'want', on 'goals'.
2. Coming up with something to 'do' to attain those goals.

Really, though, these two points are about becoming *conscious* of things that are likely *happening anyway*.

First, just because you've not pondered and written out a goal doesn't mean it isn't "in you" already (otherwise, where would the though and the writing come from?).

Second, if your goals are implicit in your character at each moment, then in fact all your actions will be aligned with your goals. And if we take the view that "you" are not separate from the rest of reality, then actually the whole universe is moving towards you experiencing your goals.

Unless you actively resist and get in the way.

> Q2: You just have to get focused for a bit until the spell is cast. Also not muddy the waters too much by obsessing on it afterwards -I think you end up kind off casting and recasting small spells when you do that- which is why forgetting about it helps a lot. The hard part is definitely to know what to wish for. Many times you yourself get changed in the process, and you can also get a lot of stuff happening peripherally to finally get to the result.

> Those days I mostly enjoy things as they are except if I'm in dire need, the upheaval a spell can set in motion just tires me. Or just ensure that there are easy ways of manifestation. Else it can gets way convoluted.

You make a good point. If you mostly let things alone - but pay attention - I think the things you actually want mostly come up 'by themselves'. The trick is to have the courage to follow through on any 'inspirations to act' you might have. You and the rest of the universe will unfold as a single movement towards your goals - however you have to not hold back from your part in the movement. Often your involvement or role can be super-minimal, simply saying "yes" when offered something, but you *must* fulfil that role. And on goals: Whether we write goals down or not, they are implied within us at any moment. (If you write down a goal or think it up, where did it come from? It was already within you, acting through you; you just made it conscious is all.) However, if we are conflicted then perhaps explicitly *deciding* via an *act* can help push aside any blocks we have.

TL;DR: If you stay clear-headed and allow spontaneity, then passive magick will likely give you most of what you really desire.

[...]

> Magick is art that you create in the mind of the universe.

That's a nice turn of phrase.

> what I now do in a short visualization bolstered by a short improvised action.

I think that gets to the heart of it. You can just declare to yourself that clicking your fingers means 'this', click 'em, and you're done. In fact, short processes leave less space for doubt and 'wishing for wishing' errors that can occur in longer, more involved approaches.

Our problem is often that *we want to feel ourselves doing something to make things happen*. This is a problem for daily life too: people tense up their muscles in order to feel that they are really putting effort into their work, even just walking and so on, when what they are in fact doing is blocking the natural flow by doing this - just *intention* is all that's required; the rest will 'do itself'.

> “When you stop doing the wrong thing the right thing does itself.”
>
> - F. M. Alexander, inventor of the Alexander Technique for body movement

One thing I have been looking into is Dream Yoga, with the practice of gradually getting yourself to *feel* that this waking life is a dream (as opposed to just think it or something like it). I see this as maybe a nice way of dissolving those inhibitory boundaries: crack the experience open completely to all possibilities.

I find experiments and comparisons with lucid dreaming are often helpful, because of how 'intention' seems to work in that environment, it's the 'ideal version'.

[...]

> But that's so boooring.

Okay, tell you what: I'll still let you wear a silly hat. But only on Tuesdays.

Manipulating Precog Dreams

This is a follow-up to my post on Ian Wilson's *You Are Dreaming* ebook. There's a short interview with Wilson and Robert Waggoner in *Dream Views* which gets straight to the meat of it: how changing a precog dream can change the outcome:

Quote:

> [**It is all intent.** There is no other means by which we can direct and focus our thoughts. Intent and dream control would be the best descriptor for this technique. If dreams are anything, they are organized thoughts.]

Which implies that perhaps the dream part isn't so important, that asserting an outcome with intent while in a suitably detached state would work also - i.e. The mechanism of magick is dream control.

A nice quote on communication:

> [That truth has to be experienced to be realized, it cannot always be handed to you. Each of us must find our own gold, our own truth.]

Ctrl-Z Magick

People occasionally report "reset" events that occur when they are in danger - such as time jumping back to before a crash, or an injury being reversed. These jumps seem to be spontaneous, and not willed. Has anyone experimented or had experience with this "Ctrl-Z" undoing of events intentionally?

[...]

My thinking then was: If the universe is basically timeless, then - like our student friends - perhaps it needn't matter when the rats are trained; the fact of maze training would help all rats to some extent. In other words, just as the later rats benefit from the first rats knowledge, so the first rats might have been benefiting from the second rats' skills. (This would need to be tested for specifically, and I'm not even sure that the nature of such an effect would even be available for testing.)

However, that's not quite the same as being able to "take time back" when one encounters a situation they don't like. It *does* demonstrate that time itself isn't a sequential set of isolated moments that can only unfold in one direction though.

If we *can* take time back, then: how? And: does the whole universe get taken back? Just your locality gets warped? Is it a case of personal realities?

> > It's worth considering that the original event that gets undone might be an extremely realistic, full-spectrum premonition.

That's an interesting possibility: An intense premonition that leads you to automatically take action to avoid it while in a state of 'imagery'. It's hard to separate the two possibilities though, obviously. Quite a few reports (e.g. suddenly being a mile away from where you experienced the crash, and there being *two* people in the car who experience the jump, etc) don't fit that idea, which makes me think there's 'something' more to it than that. Since magick (invoking our friend Fotamecus, for instance) is known to allow us to stretch or compress time, there could be some mix of time manipulation and premonition happening. But then, at what point does that get so complicated that a "magickal reset" becomes the simpler explanation?

Another explanation is just a shared 'drop out' into a dream, so that a stretch of the experience just didn't happen at all anyway. The reason for asking the OP question was that, since it's hard to tell the difference between the above explanations when they're not deliberate, perhaps stories of intentional resets by people who are already knowledgeable about the occult/magick could be insightful.

[...]

Various "stories" of types:

- Falling on a hill badly and "willing" it undone. Ankle still broken, but bones perfectly aligned for setting.
- "Willing" a reported fatal car crash undone. Going to the site, seeing an obviously bad tyre mark pattern.
- Lots of recovered objects, lost elsewhere but discovered at home or in unusual situations after "deciding" they aren't lost.

Individual stories to be taken with a pinch of salt, but all seem to have the common theme of "asserting" a positive alternative to the situation, or "asserting" the complete absence of the situation (but *not* focusing on the unfortunate situation and then trying to mentally changing it).

> I don't think I ever encountered anyone claiming that experience before the 2000s, but that's entirely my personal experience, and not something I'm holding up as historical canon.

Me neither, but the nature of the experience to me seems like it would be less "special" - e.g. UFOs and spirits and so on - and more just bewildering and confusing. I can imagine not really talking about it except to a friend or two, who probably wouldn't be very interested in talking further. Because it's rare, there's not really been a community for these people - until the Internet became generally accessible and various websites meant they'd hear other, similar stories. Circa the start of the 2000s, funnily enough.

> I think it's all storytelling, myself, and not even a misattributed experience resulting from a stressful incident. But I could be wrong.

In general with 'odd stuff', I'd agree - but these stories tend not to be very showy or looking for attention, compared to some of the others. I tend to think the *experience* is genuine; what the nature of that experience is, I don't know.

The suggestion of an intense premonition/mini-dream is a possibility. Like a minor, accidental DMT hit. Or simply the adrenaline hit of a near-miss messing with the memory. (Because of course, these incidents are reported from *memory*, so it's their memories they are reporting not the incident.)

PKD - Punched Paper Memory World

One of my favourite Philip K Dick short stories is *The Electric Ant*. Give it a read first...

SPOILERS

Anyway, it makes me think: Although we don't have a punched paper roll inside us, we *do* have an equivalent - the memory-surface of our minds. Any experiences we have leave traces, which are then activated by subsequent experiences. We don't really see the room around us directly, we get a couple of glances, and the visual and feeling memory of the room are activated. We experience our memories, rendered as senses in a "perceptual-experiential mind-space". So, if we were able to *edit* our memories - like the electric ant amending his punched paper - would we be changing our apparent reality, in a *direct experiential* way, not just altering what we'd recall when thinking-about something?

When in magick we "declare something to be true" by assertion, act or ritual, is this what we are really doing?

And to what extent did our world of experience have an external starting point anyway; perhaps it began with random noise which slowly formed stable patterns via feedback. In that case, reality is *only* memory - albeit maybe not *personal* memory - and so is completely flexible... What happens when the universe forgets something?

...the dream-like nature of waking reality - as a mind theatre inspired by, but not dictated by, the "senses". Or noise and memories?

[...]

> Our punched paper is comprised of DNA

I don't think that's true. DNA may operate as a reactive surface for biological development, but it doesn't govern your experience of reality. For instance, you learned to ride a bike - is that in your DNA now? You learned how to recognise particular objects as you went along, is that?

The "punched paper" you have now is, perhaps, patterns you've accumulated in your brain. Although I think it's better to use the word "mind" since it has less baggage (and we experience our minds; we don't experience our brains).

Faith, Natural Law, Control

> "People lost faith in natural law itself. Nothing seemed stable or fixed; the universe was a sliding flux. Nobody knew what came next. Nobody could count on anything. Statistical prediction became popular... People lost faith in the belief that they could control their environment; all that remained was probable sequence: good odds in a universe of random chance."
>
> -- *Solar Lottery*, Philip K Dick

A picture of our day, perhaps. Has our modern world lost faith in natural law? Lost faith in the belief they can control their environment? Forgotten how, or even that you could? Become subordinate to the rule of numbers and of chance? Nobody could count on anything - even themselves...

[...]

> > It's not about controlling your environment. It's about living in harmony with it

Quite possibly! :-) Many occultists, though, would say that they are interested in the subject because it offers the hope of having influence over their (personal) environment. Getting what they want, basically, or perhaps fashioning the world into a better place. Do you disagree with that aim?

The quote can also be interpreted as meaning that people have forgotten that what they intend/think has power, and that by forgetting this they allow the world to become less structured, to drift. If the environment actually *depends* on our individual and collective focus, if we let go - what is it we're living in harmony with?

Isn't that like letting go of the steering wheel of your car so that you can "live in harmony with the engine"? Or has the universe got cruise control enabled?

> > Wouldn't disagree, but controlling and influencing are quite different

Not a bad point, but where is the boundary? If I kick off a pattern and let it unfold - say - then occasionally make adjustments to it (influencing it), am I not effectively controlling it? Just because it is not constantly within my grip - I don't need to do that because the initial creative process gave it a "momentum" - does not mean it is not entirely under my control. I create it, I tweak it occasionally to ensure it's still unfolding in a pleasing direction, in line with changing circumstances.

That's basically complete control, right? Is that a bad thing? Is there something special or particularly "good" about just letting the pattern run post-creation?

> > To nature, there is no structure.

No *inherent* structure, yes I would agree with this. **The structure of our minds *is* the structure we experience as the "world"**, I might suggest?

> > > [If the environment actually depends on our individual and collective focus, if we let go - what is it we're living in harmony with?]; Can you explain please? :)

But of course! :-)

Let's say that the world is a pattern (like a ripple in some water) that is gradually spreading out, unfolding, under its own initial momentum. If we simply leave it be completely, it will just continue uninterrupted.

But if some people *unwittingly* influence the pattern, it will become deformed and vague in its direction. The pattern will become less structured. The more disparate and unfocussed the unwitting intentions, the less coherent the pattern will become. It is surely inevitable that this will happen.

If everyone lets go and tries to "live in harmony" with that, the world as happens to and experienced by individuals will gradually fall apart, working in nobody's interests. As you said, "to nature there is no structure". So trying to just stand back and live in harmony with nature, let nature take care of things without actually directing it at all, would be a mistake. You cannot actually rely on the pattern of nature unfolding appropriately!

Therefore our participation should be *active*; we should all be consciously and deliberately shaping our environments, the structure of mind.

(Maybe. I'm just exploring ideas here to see where they go.)

> The thing I'd like to give you is that living in harmony is going with the nature of things. How things act, grow, speak, etc. It's not about resisting this flow, it's about choosing its many directions in which it flows and accept the consequences of those choices.

Well, that was particularly nicely put. :-)

I also liked the imagery you conjured in me of a family having to move house because a tree started growing in it. "Darned nature, at it again!", says Father, packing his bags for the third time in a decade. "This time, we're going to live on a barge!" ;-)

So, nature sees neither good nor bad, it just flows as it is flowing. We perceive good/bad, because we have preferences for how we'd like it to flow, from a limited partial perspective.

We *are* able to influence that flow directly - quite strongly in a local way (our bodies and thoughts), apparently less so in a wider sense of the apparent larger world (using magick or synchronicity). But to actively *fight* the larger flow as it is, is folly; it doesn't work anyway, except perhaps temporarily and as a delay mechanism, and leads to suffering. So we strike a balance, seek where to draw the line, as you pointed out...

> Dominating in the sense of making something do against its nature or against its will. I agree, the line may be difficult to draw in some cases.

Some thoughts: What we call "the flow of nature" or "the nature of something" is really just an accumulation of flowing patterns from the past. How did that flow began? How has it become what it has become? What contributions have been absorbed? Not questions that are answerable, but it is now as it is, and it is going in a particular (multi-dimensional) direction.

So, we cannot *control* but we can *request* - by submitting or contributing new patterns (intentions, wishes, prayers, rituals) to the flow - and they will be accommodate. How so? Because intentions change the shape of the mind, and so change the landscape of the world, and the landscape dictates the flow of experience. Nature flows through us, as us.

Finally, what dictates the extent of influence, the impact of our intention? Perhaps it is the extent to which we hold on to existing patterns, resisting change (basically, fighting ourselves when changing ourselves). Perhaps some patterns are simply too deeply ingrained to change within a lifetime, or are part of the body's life - such as the unfolding patterns of the body itself, or patterns such as "gravity".

There is also the view that our birth was the start of a pattern, and to let it simply unfold, to flow unimpeded, is to be the most authentic we can be to our own true nature. Our *ideas* about who we are and what we want cannot ever encapsulate this direct truth, which is acting to create our world at this very moment.

Still, it's fun trying. :-)

[...]

> [Q: I understand and agree with your stance that nature "simply is," and does not pass judgement on itself. However, the fact that humans are able to make something like the periodic table clearly shows that nature has its own distinct dichotomies. In a solution of AgNO3 and NaBr, the two solutes will dissolve and form a precipitate of AgBr. Nature doesn't just say "do whatever you want," those two particular atoms will precipitate because of properties that make them unique. In a sense, nature cares greatly that these atoms will act in a particular way, separating them from other atoms that will act differently.]

Nature doesn't "care" about this though, in a judgemental way, or even in a consistent way. Habits are formed, impersonally, and those habits persist, and those habitual patterns have subsequent impacts. Perhaps that precipitate never formed until, one time, it did. And then a couple more times. And then it became an established habit, and mostly happened from then on. What I'm getting at: Nature doesn't care-take, and it doesn't design or manage, it just kinda "ends up", perhaps? It looks like regularity and law now, but that's only from our perspective in the current state of ordering.

'No Precise Programming' - Subjectivity & Science

Article that's interesting on Theodore Roszak and linking objective vs subjective science. Sample quote:

> ‘I would like to help you gain an appreciation that came to me only slowly, painfully, and with much difficulty: how our intellectual concepts and beliefs limit our ability to perceive what is really happening in the world. When the world "was" flat, the heavens "had" to move around the earth. We see the world through the blinders of our own beliefs. When the world's behavior resists our expectations, as now seems to be the case in many areas of policy analysis, we need to question whether some of our important beliefs are in accord with reality. Unfortunately, our most basic beliefs are seldom accessible to our conscious mind: they appear to us as simple, unquestionable observations about reality. . . .’
>
> ‘To truly see that one of your own beliefs is just an assumption can be liberating. This experience, though, is not amenable to precise programming. You must stretch your mind, envelop your beliefs with contrary thinking, and allow your imagination to roam in forbidden territory without automatically rejecting its perceptions as "absurdities." . . . By holding fast to certain beliefs, you may be denying a part of yourself that would come to the surface if you were willing to accept a somewhat different set of values or beliefs. . . . What I am suggesting derives from a belief in the indivisible unity of life and, therefore, in the importance of making work an integral part of the whole. . . .’
>
> ‘To be able to integrate your life, however, you will first need to re-examine your unquestioning belief in the superiority of "objective" over "subjective" research, a belief apparent in your condemnation of what you consider subjectivity in my writing. Until you relinquish this belief, you will be afraid to approach work with feeling as well as intellect for fear of losing your much-valued objectivity. But, pure "objectivity" doesn't exist, since any observations, experiments, or analysis must always be done by a person, who inescapably must have values, emotions, and feelings that influence his or her work. . . .’
>
> ‘You seem, however, to believe that because you desire to be objective you will be immune to those passions, prejudices, and dominating opinions which "are the abundant source of dangerous illusion." [Laplace.] What nonsense. I am sure that Laplace would agree with me that those most likely to be led into dangerous illusions by their emotions are those who would deny most vehemently that emotion played any role in shaping their opinions about "objective" truth. . . .’
>
> ‘I have no desire to deny that my views of the world influence my work. You term this "subjectivity" and denounce it soundly. I term it "wisdom" and recommend it highly. By drawing on all of my perceptions of the world, I believe I obtain a more complete and coherent view of the world processes that are unfolding than would be possible if I limited myself to information that I process intellectually and analytically. In a sense, I work backwards from my overall view of the world to the specifics of a given problem, applying tests of logic and evidence to check the correctness of the perceptions derived initially as well as from thinking.’
>
> -- Vince Taylor quote, *No Precise Programming*, Manas Journal, Volume XXXII 1979

[...]

In fact, I think the self-reinforcing feedback loop of experience with belief or "memory" (in its loosest sense) is fundamental to the ongoing moment, whether occult or everyday. It's rare to see this relationship referenced in a more mainstream (and readable) perspective though!

Change the memory, change the world?

We literally experience our beliefs as true, because our beliefs structure (seed) our experience, and back again. Sneaky eh? :-) Cheers!

Dramatic Effects

There has been some discussion here and elsewhere on the the influence of beliefs and expectations on the 'available routes for manifestation' for a magickal intention.

Meanwhile, some people quite dramatic random occurrences, appearances and disappearances and changes in their reality, and wonder how to harness this.

/r/occult people, what are the most dramatically direct results that you've had from an intentional working? And how do you think the situation differed to the more usual hum-drum 'roundabout coincidence' type of result?

[...]

Lots of people seem to report that their first efforts, and when they started taking it seriously, was when a "curse" worked. Suddenly you realise that with magick: a) It works, you get what you asked for and, b) It works whether or not it's a "good" thing you've asked for. It's a harsh lesson to learn.

Did you try to undo it once it started to happen? (Most people report they couldn't bring back what's been sent out, only re-intend something else afterwards.)

Extra thought: Is it really possible to have something happen to someone if they don't let it/want it somehow?

> > I love the idea of "re-intending". I am a devoted fan of Neville Goddard, who often spoke & wrote about "revision". He taught that our world is created from our imaginations, and "whatever we can make, we can unmake".

"The world is yourself pushed out", as he would say.

Well, for convenience of imagining this, I have a little diagram I quite like.


Enfolded Form
- Residual pattern built up from previous experiences, subject to direct intention
"Experiential Mind-Space"
Unfolded Object
- Experience snaps to and unfolds in alignment with enfolded forms, spontanously and automatically

Fig 1. An illustration of the relationship between enfolded forms (belief, expectation, memory traces) and unfolding experience. In an ongoing feedback process, experiences leave traces which then in-form the structure of subsequent experiences, as spatial and temporal structures - i.e. objects and narrative, respectively. To change the nature of experience requires exposure of the ground to alternative types of experience ("external" change) or a shifting of the form of the ground directly ("internal" or first-cause change).

Think of the "ground" as containing enfolded structure - traces of previous experiences, basically. This evolves and updates automatically: as experiences arise they leave traces which in-form subsequent experiences. Thinking also leaves traces, because it occurs in the same space. This leads to what we call "beliefs and expectations" or habits. Memories in the most direct sense.

Normally, people just get lumbered with whatever happens to form structurally as their "ground" or *enfolded structure*. Magick, however, is the realisation that you can re-form this ground directly via intention - and so doing, change the form of objects (spatial and temporal, things and narrative) that will subsequently arise as the "content" or *unfolding structure* of experience.

> I also tend toward the "there's nothing out there" school of thought, so it seems to be a matter of just controlling thought/feeling, and only that. Is it simple and easy to do IF we believe it is????

So, yes, there's no-*thing* out there. What you are experiencing right now is basically a sequence of "mirages", the form of which is dictated by the profile of the dunes on the desert floor.

You don't need to control thought and feeling all the time, mostly just let passing thoughts go. Occasionally, you deliberately summon a particular experience in mind with intention, and thereby update your structure - i.e. *insert new facts*, draw new shapes in the sand. A fact may be *now* or it maybe a fact of the *apparent future*. It's not ongoing control, it's occasional updates, and completely letting go - not interfering at all- in between those updates.

This is great news: Mostly, you just sit back and enjoy the show in all its multi-sensory surround-world gorgeousness, unfolding spontaneously and automatically. Now and again you decide you don't like the

direction this is going in, and you *re-direct* by inserting a new fact, setting a new *target*, and then let the unfolding head at that new angle.

Neville Goddard's nightly "re-imagine the day as it should have been" exercise is exactly this. Restructure yourself each evening such that tomorrow begins from the ideal, enfolded starting point.

> You could be someone's cat, for all I know!

Quite probably. It would be worth it for the teleporting capabilities! I might look into it as a possible career move. :-)

As you point out, the speed with which things arise can be quite astounding. If you don't realise what you're doing, if you aren't making *knowing* decisions, it can get quite out of hand pretty quickly. You really gotta remember, "it's all you". Yeah, you're right about those asterisks! The reason to be in these forums is to explore your own thoughts and maybe in the process other people get something out of it too, which feeds back to your own thinking. Eventually, though, there's nothing more to be said!

Good that Neville G is getting a bit of exposure. He got the fundamental thing right (the 'felt sense' with intention) well before most people. Nothing wrong with a bit of theatre or visualisation, but it's good to recognise that it's just a means of indirectly adjusting your global felt structure of the world.

[...]

> [Q: Well, I've never tried to do anything outside of things that can affect my mind, but that's still had some amazing effects. I have a habit of going off on tangents very easily. It's impossible for me to get out of it on my own, and it usually leads to me blowing up at someone. Well, one day, while walking home, I was in another tangent over some conversation at school. Finally, I was tired of this shit; the constant bickering and damage in my head, so I mentally screamed **"STOP!!** At that moment, I got a strong vision of being surrounded in a whirlwind of fireflies. I'd never seen anything like it before, and it was beautiful. After they disappeared, I was calm, but tired. I felt like I had used an enormous amount of energy to get me out of that funk, but I still hold that memory clear. There was another time with sleep paralysis. My second night of having it, I had woken up to me being held in place by shadow snakes. I was terrified, but again I called out the name of a servitor of mine that tried to recreate the whirlwind abilities. This time, fireflies came to my rescue and started consuming the shadow snakes in their bright lights. It was a beautiful sight to behold, but less draining then the firefly tornado.]

Go fireflies! Great imagery.

Since the fireflies came to you naturally, you should try to utilise them for other things. Send them out on missions on your behalf. Don't drain yourself though by over-intending; let them take the weight.

Control vs Letting Go

What are our opinions on trying to *control* our world and environment by technique and will (direct approach), versus *letting go* and undoing ourselves to achieve greater clarify (indirect approach)? In the end, both approaches seem to have the same aim (a mastery over experience, or an expansion of it), but they are quite a contrast in path. Do we have particular ideas on one vs the other, and how to approach each path?

[...]

Hmm. And perhaps "letting go" as both a way to allow experience to flow more easily, and also to (ironically) make "control" easier, as you have reduced inner-conflict.

The "external" experiences, or unfolded objects, arise in alignment with your enfolded forms (beliefs, assumptions, expectations, character) just as your thoughts do. You can fight the unfolded objects, again and again, but they will just re-spawn, because you haven't tackled the "facts" of the world. Amend the "facts" (your enfolded beliefs and mental posture), amend the phenomena. Whether this results in no bullies arising, or simply that bullies don't bother you, depends on the nature of the "fact" and its new version?

If I suffer from headaches and neck pain, I can keep taking painkillers to change the experience (object to object), or I can notice my bad posture, and change myself > change the experience (form to object).

No need to control the objects, if the underlying forms have been tackled.

> Q: The two aren't contradictory, perhaps we could interchange control with will here? It could be one's will to engage his/her world and environment by technique and will. You don't have to choke every aspect of life to death to get what you want.

Control maybe better phrased as "holding on" in that case. With "will" just the occasional redirecting of yourself/the world. That way it's a balance: Always having the open, "let go" attitude - with occasional "re-targeting" ?

[...]

> On the other hand as this happens I also am put in circumstances that cause me to grow and learn and let go further. Perhaps as I let go the blocks and tension are released also for me to work through.

"Put in circumstances", yes. There is an interplay between the inner and the outer, which I guess goes back to the idea of one being a reflection of the other.

> Be a good partner to life and the outer world.

I love that metaphor: ***Working in partnership with life.***

It's very tempting to constantly fiddle and manipulate yourself/the world, pushing yourself along, "end-gaining" - but that has the side effect of fogging your vision of who you are at that time, and to the way things are naturally flowing at that moment. Spending most of your time *watching, listening, being, doing*, with a small intervention here and there - itself coming from inspiration - is much more effective. I come to realise the hard way! :-)

/r/Psychonaut

The Girl Who Saw Through Illusions

A little story I liked:

> **The Girl Who Saw Through the Illusions** *By Leo Babauta*
>
> The girl was at work when one of her coworkers said something demeaning about her work, and she immediately got upset, felt defensive, and thought all day about how the coworker was wrong and how she could prove it to him. At home, her boyfriend left his dirty dishes in the sink and the trash was overflowing and she felt irritated by his lack of consideration. She thought about how wrong he was, and why couldn't he just do these little things to be more considerate?
>
> As she was stewing in her anger over these two people who had wronged her ... she wondered what was going on. Why did she have to be so frustrated, angry, irritated, by these little comments and actions?
>
> The next day, she went to work, and noticed other people also frustrated and stressed out and angry at different times in the day. She saw it in the faces of strangers on the street, then in the complaints of her friends when they went out for a bite to eat after work.
>
> What was going on?
>
> Then she began to see something strange. What she saw was this: each person had a treasure they were protecting. A beautiful gem that no one else could see, but that they felt was really valuable and that needed guarding. An Inner Gem.
>
> When one person would interact with the other, even if the actions or conversations had nothing to do with the Inner Gem ... each person would worry that the other was trying to attack their Inner Gem. Everything became about guarding the gem, protecting it from attack, making sure it was safe.
>
> The girl realized that the gems didn't really exist. She realized that we just imagine them to be real, and don't realize we're doing it.
>
> She realized that it's all an illusion.
>
> And it's making us unhappy.
>
> So that day, she stopped trying to protect an imaginary gem. She stopped trying to be right, to be seen as good and competent and smart and perfect, to see herself as a good person at all times. She stopped thinking that other people's words and actions had anything to do with what she imagined herself to be. She stopped trying to protect her position and self-image.
>
> And, gently letting go of these illusions, she became happier. She would smile when someone else would start protecting their imaginary gem, and realize that their frustration or rudeness had nothing to do with her, but everything to do with the gem they were protecting. She would go about her day, enjoying herself, and trying to make the world a better place.
>
> *-- Blog entry from Leo Babauta's Zen Habits*

[...]

That's the idea, although I'd broaden it to being any sense of localised identity, a space that you are defending against the larger environment.

A step back in your head - and this is kinda literally true isn't it? An easier and more persistent approach is (I find) so switch "context" to the background space that experience is arising in.

Of course, you then have to just let actions be spotaneous and not push or rush or interfere - as soon as you do, your attention narrows (because that's how direct action works: you don't do it, you squeeze your attention). Great when you're in it though! :-)

> Never take anything personally

Right - because there's no "person".

> What matters? You decide.

Yes, quite so.

[...]

> Q: In my way of thinking, the gem is not ego or individuality, but rather free will. I think free will is an illusion - a bad one, which makes us think that people are "responsible" for their mistakes, that they "deserve" punishment, and so on... the false idea of free will is, I think, the root of all anthropogenic human suffering.

An interesting idea. I'm not entirely with it, maybe. I'd say that "free will" varies in terms of context - in terms of the "sphere of attention". Someone who is narrowed on the body or certain thoughts is limited. Meanwhile, someone whose attention has expanded to the "background awareness" has more flexibility, greater choice. After all, free will isn't about the ability to do just *anything*, surely - it's about being free to choose among the maximum number of possible options, to take the route most appropraite for you. However, this "maximum freedom" is in a sense spontaneous, potentially - the only choice you fully have is the ability to "say yes" to it, to cease resisting. And of course, to be able to switch to this larger context, you have to either have encountered the concept of it ("grace") or just randomly have it happen to you (also "grace").

> [Q: I'm not against the idea of freedom, the capacity to act. My problem is with free will, the idea that there's some sort of magical essence which is making "choices" and is "responsible" for its actions. It is manifestly obvious that the mind is an emergent phenomenon resulting from the brain, thus all our choices are the result of the shape of our brain, which itself can be explained entirely in terms of genetics, past experience, present environment, and of course the ever present quantum randomness. How can you blame someone for doing something which was the inevitable result of things entirely out of their control, some deterministic (as with genetics), some chaotic (as with experience and environment) and some random? Nowhere in that mess of causes is there room for a magical "free will force". When you let go of that manifestly ignorant, superstitious idea and recognize that all events, including choices, are the inevitable result of the laws of physics, you become able to forgive, to have mercy, to love unconditionally, as you realize that the illusion of self control is just that - an illusion. You also can learn to forgive yourself. Your mistakes are not "your fault." They were inevitable

> imperfections in an imperfect world - but the self acceptance which results from this realization inevitably causes some of those imperfections to disappear, and through the butterfly effect, a great good is unleashed upon the world.]

Okay, I'll probably disagree from the "obvious of emergence" part for consciousness, but we can certainly say that the *content* of consciousness has correlations with the brain. We do have free will in the sense of identifying with one part of experience vs the rest, and having the power to pause and select amongst options. We don't choose those options, and we don't choose what we want to choose, but within the parameters of the environment we can select and "disobey".

So self control itself isn't an illusion, what is in debate is the basis of the control in terms of information. If we don't have free will in that sense, then we can't choose to let go, or to learn. If anything is a "magical free will force" it is awareness itself, which then turns out to accept what arises - so the real deal is that to operate the best you could ever operate would be to let go and have your *entire being* contribute to your actions. Also, I think that we can pause and 'ask' for random creative inspiration, and then act on it or not. This makes us completely unpredictable. We can always ask for additional options, in effect.

It turns out that even worms have free will, apparently.

> I suggest you research chaos theory.

I know what you're getting at, but I would say that we can't extend chaos theory to brains quite yet.

> Do you mean attention, which is a product of brain patterns and is thus chaotic?

Is it a product of brain patterns? Where is it?

> Or do you mean consciousness, that which perceives, the inexpressible "essence" of mind which is aware of those brain patterns?

Consciousness. I use the term "awareness" because consciousness gets confused with *conscious-of* and *self-consciousness*. I'm not convinced that consciousness is "emergent" from the brain. I'm inclined to say that it is a fundamental property. But that's a separate discussion, and it does not necessarily matter for "free will".

> Where in all this are you seeing a free will force?

I don't suggest there is a free will *outside of experience*, I suggest something more akin to (as another responder said) compatiblism: There is a part of us we identify with, and there are the options which appear. Furthermore, we can 'ask' for further options. We are "free" only to the extent we can choose amongst the options presented to us, using all the information at our disposal. In other words, we can make the *best* choice. That's "free enough".

Can I add, though, that brains are deterministic 'in principle' but really we are nowhere near understanding the brain, so I stay back from saying things "are" this or that. I try to stick to my own experience, as it arises subjectively, initially. The step between determinism and randomness may be something more structured, a probability pattern based on intention. There is also the issue of self-reinforcing "perceptual memory" which needs to be explored.

Maximum free will: To have all the information in the universe available to you, and to choose your actions based on this. Which would be deterministic of course; you would always choose the best option.

> My problem is with the idea that there's this supernatural force beyond the brain capable of controlling it...

Well, brains are a problem because we really don't know anything about them and how the correspond to subjective experience (beyond certain content correlations, and even there much of it is the opposite of what is expected). So we put that aside.

I say that "Free Will" is the ability to choose amongst options based on all the information available to you. That's all that is required and that definition will outlast any changing notions of what a "self" is and what consciousness is.

> I do not understand what you mean by deterministic in principle.

We have to say "in principle" because we do not actually understand or have knowledge of the mechanisms in use, we are drawing conclusions from out *concepts* of determinism and randomness. For instance, in practice what we have called "randomness" might not be what it seems.

> I don't know enough about neuroscience to give you details...

Right. Really, if you actually look into the neuroscience, although it is grand for helping patients who have suffered brain damage and so on, it is basically rubbish as regards investigating the properties of awareness and subjective experience. Because it is not intended to - it's not "science" in the same way as physics. Poorly designed fMRI-based experiments do not a good understanding make, alas.

That's why I tend to put the brain aside, as it were. The theories change so frequently (e.g. for vision and perception, etc) as to be meaningless.

> Yes, of course pure consciousness (that which perceives) is a self-existent, nonphysical phenomenon, however it is somehow interlinked to the brain...

There are correlations between experience and brain activity. Changes in the brain cause changes in the *content of experience*. This is different to consciousness.

For clarity, it is good to separate out different types: there is the consciousness (which I call "awareness" or *being-aware* to keep it distinct), then conscious-*of* (the content) and *self*-consciousness (the identification with a certain subset of content).

There are all sorts of issues with correlation 'attention' and even 'memories' with direct brain regions, etc.

Anyway, I'm tempted along these lines:

- What you are, is "open unbounded awareness".
- Within this, experiences arise.
- From the outside (3rd person) the brain is seen as the "image" of this activity, in the world dream as it were.
- This means that brain imagery will show:
    - Some correspondence to the surrounding environment (if that is what is being experienced).
    - Some correspondence to the thinking going on (if that is what is being experienced)

    - And: triggering brain regions would be expected to result in experience in awareness, just as a passing train would.
- The brain is not causal; it something you are aware of It's like observing images in someone's eye, and noticing that if you poke the eye they report different experiences.

In other words, what's really happening is that there is correspondence between *the unbroken continuum that is the world* and one's subjective experiential content. There is much more that can be said about that (your awareness actually includes the whole extended world, it's just that the content is "brighter" in the brain area if you end up focussed there), but then we drift off-topic.

Returning to: I say that "Free Will" is the ability to choose amongst options based on all the information available to you.

The key here is, what information is available to you? Is it just the information localised in the brain area?

> And I daresay science knows a lot more about the brain than you seem to believe.

I keep a good eye on it. Brains and consciousness and metaphysics are main areas of interest for me. Neuroscience is as rigorous as physics as a discipline as far as it goes, however (and actually physics is inclined to this of late) it makes public promises it doesn't know it can keep. Consciousness is one of them.

(It reminds me of the early days of genetic research, where we were going to have a "gene for every characteristic" via its blueprint. Of course, the reality turned out to be something quite different.)

> The fact that the theories change frequently is proof that progress is being made quickly, not that they're all meaningless.

Or it means that it's ungrounded and unfocussed, with a 'theory-of-the-week' approach, because it hasn't yet developed an overarching and coherent framework. Individual research results are interesting and thorough, the attempt to connect the parts, however, falters.

> Your awareness does not extend throughout the world. That is a manifestly superstitious concept.

I think you are misinterpreting me. Briefly put: I suggest that *consciousness is fundamental* as a property, and this is how we can connect 3rd-person and 1st-person views. It is not "my" awareness that extends throughout the world in an external view, however everything that I experience *of* the world does arise in my awareness.

> stick to pure materialism and rationalism

Sticking to pure materialism is a problem, because it doesn't work, unfortunately, for these areas. It's fine as an unexamined background idea for 'patterns and regularities' as observed in physics, but it's no use for consciousness, alas. This doesn't mean we go to "woo land", it simply means we incorporate consciousness as a property (a la neuroscientist Christoph Koch, perhaps). Note, this isn't *self*-consciousness! Rocks don't ponder their existence. However, sufficiently complex entities *do* have a "what it is like to be them".

For humans, the brain is the image of that, but of course that reflects the complete nervous system, which in turn reflects the environment, so effectively the brain is an image of the world. That is what I mean by the world being unbroken in awareness.

Where do you suggest consciousness "is" in the brain? And why does it have that location and not another? And what is the stage at which an area flips from being not-conscious to conscious?

Inserting consciousness at a fundamental level skips all of those problems. The entire brain becomes the experience that appears in and as consciousness. We keep all of our great neuroscience stuff (brain patterns == experiential content) but don't need to worry about 'how come it becomes aware of itself'.

> [Q: I agree that it's fundamental. I've agreed with that all along. But it only exists in the presence of information processing. You know how supernovae generate neutrinos? Well, information processing produces consciousness. I see it as a kind of field, like an electric field, only generated by phenomena which process information, rather than by just any charged particle. It is a field in abstract space, rather than any concrete location. It's not "in" the brain, any more than an electric field is "in" an electron. It results from the brain, and exists in some dimension of reality which we cannot yet measure. Whenever anything - neuron, transistor, or otherwise - enacts an "if then" statement, compares a set of data to a threshold and outputs the result of that comparison, thought is happening, consciousness is happening. You know how mass bends spacetime? Information processing bends consciousness-space. No, better yet - information processing IS consciousness, the same way gravity IS the curvature of spacetime. And how do you know the amount of consciousness? It is proportional to the level of processing, the level of pattern recognition. Anything that discerns patterns is conscious. The more complex the discernable patterns, the higher the level of consciousness. The more connections among processing units, the more consciousness. But NONE of this leads to free will.]

We're not so far apart - for instance, I agree there is something that could be called a 'fundamental field', only it has no spatial or temporal properties. It's only property is *being-aware* and it comes *before* neutrinos and the like. And before information. Because it comes before patterns - patterns are formed *within* and *of* it. And *that* is what "consciousness" is.

Note, that being aware *of* things and being *self* conscious is a different level, and it misnamed because, indeed, it is a form of patterned experienced.

> > The more connections among processing units, the more consciousness.

There is never "more consciousness" in the way I say it. I think we're differing in our use of the term. In my take, you'd mean something like "an increased ability to be aware of things and manipulate them". Something like "greater awareness *of* things". All information processing does is transform one pattern into one or more different patterns. It does not change the 'stuff' that patterns are made of (which is "consciousness").

Free will is dependent on which perspective you are viewing things from. Someone standing in a 3-dimensional perspective would have free will in 2-dimensional world, although they would not be able to experience their 3-d will via their senses (they would only see the 2-d results and have to infer their intentions from those). From a 4-d perspective, the actions of the 3-d being would be predetermined. In the limit, it is a static universe and there is no free will because there is no movement. However, that's not how we live our lives; we take a trajectory across all possibilities, and if we can choose our trajectory based on our present position, that is sufficient. The question is, what dimensionality are we?

> I have no idea what you're talking about. Try to stick to falsifiability and scientific rigor instead of going off on New Age speculations. I respect your intellect, but pseudoscience bugs me. :3

Ha! It's not pseudoscience, honest. :-) Just trust me when I say that, even if I'm talking 'off plan', I'm trying to use metaphors to describe something I'm thinking, to explore the topic; I'm not saying it's a finished idea to be tested! :-)

Anyway, I think - The problem is that we will never be able to come up with a falsifiable model for consciousness if it is the fundamental thing *prior to* space and time - because all our experiments will be in terms of it. It's a matter of metaphysics, rather than physics. If we *don't* introduce it at a fundamental level, then we are left with handling emergence. And by "fundamental" I mean it has to be introduce *before* any patterns - i.e. before any information. And in the end, it *must* join together scientific theories *and* personal direct experience, other wise it's just another nice diagram for the collection.

The dimensionality stuff: A bit of fun inspired by *Flatland*. But it probably is an important perspective to keep in mind when dealing with 'how we act'. We can only experience the *result* of our actions; we can't experience ourselves causing them. On a simple level, you can't experience yourself causing your arm to move. And no, describing 'brain signals' doesn't help - that's on the same level of explanation. (Why is why free will is discounted, of course.)

Interesting how we differ! :-)

> ...experience of will and consciousness is actually equivalent to brain processes, arising from them and inextricably connected.

I don't believe this. I don't think we ever experience ourselves willing or (better to say) intending. We only experience the results. I don't think consciousness has a structure, although *can be structured*. I think intention shapes consciousness (non spatially, non temporally) and that shaping is reflected subsequently in the body. If we put aside "arising from" then perhaps we can get somewhere. The brain is the 'image' of the local experience, at that time. Intention is not an experience. Missing this point is why all those free will / response experiments are a misguided waste of time; the intention had already occurred, we do not operate ourselves manually and in detail.

> I believe that within my lifetime the technology will become available to transfer my mind and consciousness to an artificial structure...

I don't believe this either - well, not on the current trajectory. And I think the problem will turn out to be, that your "conscious perspective" doesn't actually have a location, but it can have its attention focused on something. We might be able to create the structures, but at present science is completely ignorant on consciousness (rather than the *content of* consciousness). If you create another brain, you will have recreated the *content* of the experience, but you will not have transferred the experiencer. How to you transfer the experiencer (or transfer yourself), when it is not made from anything? Perhaps via an OBE?

That'll be the problem to solve.

It would be the ultimate medical advancement though - mixing the mechanical and the metaphysical, creating new vehicles and using 'spiritual practices' (I say smiling) to transfer yourself.

> [Q: It's simple enough, to transfer one mind to another brain. First copy the structure. Then, via nanotech or some sort of neural implant, connect the two brains together, and keep them connected for a long period of time until the subject's every experience, thought, and emotion is reflected in both brains equivalently. Then put the original, flesh brain to sleep. The computer brain, however, will still be awake - one's mind and consciousness will have been transferred.]

Um, I don't really see how that would work. Consciousness isn't ciphenable surely...

And if the brain is my "image" in the world, then creating a duplicate image at best just creates another perspective with the same formatting. If I am to switch myself into that perspective, it can't be physical so a connection wouldn't help.

Metaphysical Speculations

Ropes and Snakes: Objects, Conclusions, Levels

One of the difficulties I still have with idealism is the experience of illusion. So, there are two sorts of illusion, I venture:

- Seeing something as it is but misunderstanding its nature (seeing objects in front of me but thinking there is a real solid secret underlying object beyond the visual image).
- Seeing something as it is not (seeing a "snake" only to later realise that it is a "rope", and then seeing it as a rope).

The first is easily explainable. The evidence is the same, the interpretation is different. We do not see the interpretation, we think it. In the second case, though, we see the interpretation. One solution would be to say that we always experience the interpretation, so there is really only one kind of illusion. We always see our conclusions, but assume those conclusions are the nature of the objects; we only notice this when the conclusion changes and experience 'snaps' from one form to the other. However, this gets us back to there being two levels again: what I experience, and what is "really there". Any thoughts?

How does non-duality differ from idealism? Actually, I think I assumed them to be the same, until contemplating the illusion thing, and realising there was still an implied split level. (Also, the experience of looking at paintings and - snap - suddenly realise what they are depicting, etc.) How does non-duality work around that?

Been thinking... Does non-duality work around it by saying that "the stuff of the world" has both a physical and mental aspect? This would be similar to how David Bohm approaches it in A new theory of the relationship of mind and matter. Or is it more akin to an 'extended idealism', where we are saying that all objects are made of 'mind' but they arise from a continuous background of 'mind', like a blanket folding in on itself to make shapes, or waves in water. In other words, idealism with self-awareness and no divisions. Which I guess is the same as materialism with self-awareness and no divisions....

Comments

/r/Oneirosophy

Reply to “What is Oneirosophy?”

> [**cosmicprankster420** (OP): Oneirosophy is an idea i have been playing around with which basically is a combination of dream yoga and gnosticism but without any tradition or dogma. In a way it can be thought of as the chaos magick equivalent of dream yoga or chaos yoga if you will in that it attempts to use lucid dreaming and or lucid waking to gain a deeper level of lucidity in this dream world. What separates Oneirosophy from tibetan dream yoga is that while dream yoga seeks the dissolving of the ego and entering nirvana, Oneirosophy is only about achieving and maintaining lucidity in this ideaverse and it is up to the practitioner to decide what he or she wants to do from there. It is open to practitioners of both left and right hand paths.
>
> Oneirosophy also has parallels to the Thelemic concept of true will, Oneirosophy is about being able to be lucid in this world to create a dream more tailored to your own unique will.
>
> Ultimately Oneirosophy has a lot of room to be explored, whatever it really means is still somewhat unknown, but through discussion it can be explored much deeper. Many people claim to be subjective idealists and feel that this world is a dream, but there are still many challenges and obstacles that bind us to the material world. Oneirosophy proposes discovering personal techniques to maintain a sense of lucidity as well as recognizing and overcoming obstacles that hinder our progress]

Perfect timing! I've finally got around to playing more seriously with a Dream Yoga type approach (having done lucid dreaming for years), one reasonably independent from any particular traditional worldview hopefully - although various sources can act as inspiration. I've been experimenting with trying to be more direct, and 'overwrite' the sense of boundaries with empty space, to create a direct non-dual, open feeling - a sort of unbroken 'ideational space':

> [As stated above, an important part of this practice is to experience yourself as a dream. Imagine yourself as an illusion, as a dream figure, with a body that lacks solidity. Imagine your personality and various identities as projections of mind. Maintain presence, the same lucidity you are trying to cultivate in dream, while sensing yourself as insubstantial and transient, made only of light. This creates a very different relationship with yourself that is comfortable, flexible, and expansive.
>
> In doing these practices, it is not enough to simply repeat again and again that you are in a dream. The truth of the statement must be felt and experienced beyond the words. Use the imagination, senses, and awareness in fully integrating the practice with felt experience. When you do the practice properly, each time you think that you are in a dream, presence becomes stronger and experience more vivid. If there is not this kind of immediate qualitative change, make certain that the practice has not become only the mechanical repetition of a phrase, which is of little benefit. There is no magic in just thinking a formula; the words should be used to remind yourself to bring greater awareness and calm to the moment. When practicing the recognition, "wake" yourself – by increasing clarity and presence – again and again. until just remembering the thought, "This is a dream," brings a simultaneous strengthening and brightening of awareness]

- *The Tibetan Yogas of Dream and Sleep*, Tenzin Wangyal Rinpoche

[...]

I think we want to be "awake" as in to have *clarity* of experience, but recognise we are "dreaming" in the sense of being aware that what we are experiencing has a *transparency* to it, that there is nothing behind the imagery, no "solid underlying". I think you need clear and expanded attention to do this; I think that's what our friend Tenzin's getting at.

See if we are on the same page: For instance, a simple exercise is getting yourself to understand *directly* that what you are experiencing right now is an 'idea space' in which forms are appearing. Obviously, we normally assume that we are looking out from a body and the world is "out there", and we *literally feel* this to be true. So that spell needs to be broken. How to do?

A couple of things I've played with:

1. If that model were the case, we wouldn't be able to direct our attention to where we are looking out from (the space in the opposite direction from the 'vision' in front of us), and we wouldn't be able to reach out with our attention and literally feel the space around us. But we can. In fact, you can 'feel' in all directions forever. And when we explore our location, where our body and head is, we find mostly just empty space, with a couple of sensations 'hanging there'. No "me".
2. Do the "where is your hand?" experiment. Put your hand in front of your face, and ask where your *real* hand is, try to point to it. The hand in front of you isn't your real hand (by standard thinking), it's an image created by your brain 'inspired' by received bodily sensations. But if you find yourself pointing to your head/brain as the location, then ask yourself: ah, but where is my *real* head? And so on.
3. If I hear a sound, and pay attention to it, I might ask "where am I relative to this sound?". The usual answer is that I am "here" and the sound is "over there". But when I really pay attention, I discover that I am *right beside the sound*, coincident with it, as well as being over here, where my body sensations are.

Eventually we discover that the "feeling of being over here" is usually just a particular body sensation or mental image we are attached to and that we identify with (often a sensation in the neck or middle body, or an image of a 'dot' somewhere behind the eyes, a mini-homunculus) and perhaps a sphere of extended space around our body sensations that we count as "us".

But the more we deliberately summon and create a feeling of "open, empty space forever" in place of this, the more we dissolve those habits, and the more we feel that we are the 'idea space' or 'mind space' (or *dream-space*) in which experiences arise. Then, when we fall asleep, instead of us disappearing, we have the experience of the world dissolving, sense by sense, and then dreams forming - *within* us.

That's the idea anyway, I think.

TL;DR: I think we become lucid in daily life by combining an increased clarity of waking with a direct understanding of the dreamlike transparency of objects, so that waking and dreaming life are experienced as arising in the same 'mind space' = us.

You will feel more awake, but the world will feel more dreamlike.

> Q: But to me "waking up" means returning to the context of convention. It means returning to the body

"Waking up to the dream" is perhaps a better phrase, rather than just "waking up". You're not trying to wake up to somewhere else, you're just coming to an understanding of your actual situation. So maybe it's better to just say "becoming lucid" or some such instead, to avoid confusion.

> Q: I don't agree with your "No me" phrase. It's a popular one, and I get really tired arguing with it.

Ah yes, I used the quotes around "me" deliberately...

> Q: No "me".

...to indicate there is no "me" as in an *object*. (I could have been clearer.) What I discover by investigation is that I've been mis-identifying myself and mis-locating myself. I should be identifying myself with the entire space of my experience and all that arises within it.

> Q: I am 100% against the complete abandonment of oneself.

Yes, becoming lucid means a recognition of what you were all along; it's just a clarification of the oneself, not an abandonment of it. What you thought you were turns out to be a 'dream character', whereas you are 'the dream(er)'. Loosely speaking.

> Q: In this way I vehemently disagree with the Advaitans who keep harping about lack of free will.

I think they do this because of a key difficulty with volition, or *intention* as I tend to call it. That is, you can never *experience* intending or doing - you can't experience "first cause" - only the results, so they discount it. Strangely, though, their reasoning should lead them in the opposite direction:

If what I am is that 'space' then every experience and form arising in it is me 'taking the shape of that experience', like um, a blanket folding in upon itself. The blanket moves itself, one bit doesn't move the other bit, it shapes itself. Just as when we say "I moved my arm" really what happens is "our arm moves", so it is with the content of experience.

> *"To intend is to wish without wishing, to do without doing. There is no technique for intending. One intends through usage."* – Carlos Castaneda, *The Art of Dreaming*

Aside: Throughout this, I've put aside the issue of intersubjectivity - that we all have different perspectives, as if we are different consciousnesses looking through our own 'viewports' - but I think once you get to grips with the personal aspect, this comes out of it.

> Q: You always move the known universe at all times no matter how tiny and selective your movement appears to you.

Yes! Because previously you thought of you as thoughts, sensations, body vs the universe, but now you realise that *all that* is the universe. You *intend* a change, and then results appear: related thoughts arise, inspired bodily actions appear, the environment around you moves toward your goal. If your present moment universe in its entirely was an image, it's like the old morphing effect that was so popular in movies circa mid-80s, as you transition to the new desired state. I think this could be a good sub.

> [**Nefandi:** Yes, it's because "the arm" makes no sense by itself and it can't be moved by itself. "The arm" only makes sense in the greater context, and you have to change the relations in that context to move even one particle of dust in that context. In other words, in the picture that we see nothing is by itself. Everything contextualizes everything else. All meanings are interdependent. There is no arm without the sky, no sky without water and grain and trees, etc. It's not obvious at first, but if you trace what it means for a sky to be a sky, you'll discover it's connected to every other idea we have about phenomenal conventional reality. So for example, the sky has to be up. Without up it's not the sky we know. The sky has clouds, sun, stars and the moon appear in it. If these didn't appear, it wouldn't be the sky we know. Clouds can produce rain. If clouds couldn't produce rain, they wouldn't be the clouds we know. Rain falls down. If rain didn't fall in the downward direction, it wouldn't be the rain we know. Rain hits the earth. If rain were to fall downward endlessly without ever hitting any earth, that wouldn't be any kind of rain we currently understand. This brings us to earth. And so on. So once you look into the ideas, it seems like they're arranged in a web. Almost like the world wide web on the internet, but 100% inside our own mind(s). This is how we structure our experiences. The spacial and temporal contexts are all fused like this too. Something that's 100 meters/yards away from here is conceptually connected to what's right here in the same way earth is connected to the sky and is inconceivable without it from the POV of convention. Actually "connected" is not a good word. More like "inseparable."
>
> This is why if a single thought or a single hair appear to move, what really happens is that the known universe changes its state according to your volition, but then you associate yourself with just a thought or that hair, and disown the rest of the universe as if it were something foreign to your being. The known universe is not complete without every thought and every hair, however they are experienced.]

Good points. This is why so much formal instruction is about encouraging the student to perceive the space around and between objects while attending to the objects themselves, to realise that one requires the other, and that they are *the same thing*. In a sense, it is the surrounding context that can make a change: if you were not the space around your arm, it could never be moved.

[...]

There are lots of people playing with the crossover between 'magick' and perception of reality.

At its simplest, it does seem that just having an 'intention' does lead to the universe moving towards your desire - that includes the thoughts that appear to you, the actions you are inspired to take, and the events that randomly occur in the environment around you. And if you don't deliberately intend at all, you will still have things occur that correspond to your 'true will'. Your job is to 'listen' to what's going on and follow the opportunities.

But how to smooth this process? How to perceive more clearly and how to have your 'intention' operate most directly? That's where I see the Dream Yoga approach coming in, to remove the boundary between yourself and your perceived environment.

You're right about most religions having at least an element of this. Buddhism, obviously, but interpretations of Christianity also. There was a guy called Neville Goddard last century who basically thought of the Bible as an instruction manual for "how reality really works", with all the parables being illustrations of the key points. There are lots of his lectures available online, however you can get his main book, *The Power of Awareness*, here, which cuts to the main idea:

> Q: The keys are desire, imagi- nation, and a steadily focused attention on the **feeling of the wish fulfilled**. To such a man any undesirable objective fact is no longer a reality and the ardent wish no longer a dream.

Okay, the language is of its time, but worth a read (since it's free). Thee emphasises perhaps an important point we are missing: You can visualise and imagine and ritualise all you want, but these are probably just paths to *feeling the feeling that you would feel if what you desire were already the case* - it's this *feeling of truth* that makes your environment adjust its form.

(That's why I emphasise developing the *feeling* that you are living in, and are part of, and made from, a dream environment - I really think that's the way to go.)

[...]

> Q: This sounds really cool, but I'm not sure what the overall goal is. Is it to become skilled lucid dreamers? That is kind of fun in itself, but eventually gets kind of old. Why is it good to "feel like [you] are in a lucid dream during waking reality?"

It's to *become skilled waking dreamers!* :-)

Reply to “How I have changed my core beliefs throughout my lucid dreaming career.”

Random quote to end the day, since it seems appropriate to this and the other thread we're running:

> “In my first twenty years of lucid dreaming, as I came to seek an ultimate or base reality beyond symbols and appearance, beyond dream- ing and lucid dreaming, something deep within allowed the awareness that enlivens me to experience the "clear light" of pure awareness (as described in chapter 7). After exiting that experience, I knew that each dot of awareness, each speck of aware light, existed equally with all others and equally connected to all others. The awareness of the collective could be accessed in the awareness of the tiniest speck.
>
> From that moment, I sensed that behind all appearances an un- paralleled, profound connection exists at a deep, deep level. Beneath each experience lies a connectedness. Behind each life, each object, each action, an awareness exists joined to all other life, objects, and actions. The inner working of all this awareness spills out into a reality formed and experienced and connects all in a massive symphony of individual creativity and fulfilment.
>
> In certain moments, if you allow it, you can sense that the world around you is deeply interconnected: the sound of this bird is connected to a neighbor opening his door, the wind rustling the leaves announces the car appearing around the corner, your brief sudden thought of a friend lies in synchronicity with an action hundreds of miles away. The thought, the wind, the car, the bird, all connect at some deeper level where awareness resides, intersects, creates, and fulfills. Behind all ap- pearances lies the movement of awareness.”

- *Lucid Dreaming: Gateway to the Inner Self*, Robert Waggoner

[...]

There's also a tendency for people to "forget" unusual experiences. The just don't get attached to the rest of their memories; they let them go. I actually found it hard to stick at lucid dreaming initially because daily life would quickly 'overwrite' the feeling and disconnect me from it, then I'd 'wake up to it' again.

> > Q: I was excited to have this thought but also angry that I didn't think of it myself and needed some stupid book to remind me. I always feel like that about great ideas, lol. I feel ashamed that I didn't already know them on my own, how dare I not know them?

Of course, if this is a dream, then you *created* the dream book to tell yourself about the dream nature of your reality. So really, you did think of it **Y**ourself, just not *y*ourself. ;-)

> > Q: If you just relax and ignore your dreams, your dream rules can remain the same throughout your human lifespan or they can drift around a bit.

Just as in life. If you never consciously 'intend' or 're-intend' (either in moving forward or resisting a direction) then you and your life environment (the same thing) will just play out automatically.

Many people don't realise they can direct themselves; they just experience themselves. Hence all that talk about 'karma' in various writings; really I think this can be viewed as just clearing out 'bad intentions' (or directions) I think.

I think we can be *mostly* automatic - once we make our occasional intentional adjustments we can let them run - but if you make none at all, you're in trouble. Particularly because external events will, if you don't 'stay awake', adjust your 'character' and implicit direction, and send you off to the wrong place.

A main thing in all this seems to be, at a minimum: *pay attention* and *always listen*. You don't necessarily need to interfere, but you need to be aware, and do a spot of magickal intention to counter 'drift'.

Nefandi means well. This kind of thing.

> "There is one warning regarding this practice: it is important to take care of responsibilities and to respect the logic and limitations of conventional life. When you tell yourself that your waking life is a dream, this is true, but if you leap from a building you will still fall, not fly. If you do not go to work, bills will go unpaid. Plunge your hand in a fire and you will be burned. It is important to remain grounded in the realities of the relative world, because as long as there is a "you" and "me," there is a relative world in which we live, other sentient beings who are suffering, and consequences from the decisions we make."

- *The Tibetan Yogas of Dream and Sleep*, Tenzin Wangyal Rinpoche

Some people can get pretty lost in this stuff, because on the one hand *it works* (intention via subjective reality worldview does have effects), but on the other hand there are limits and dangers.

On communication, you only need to take a look here on this very sub to see how challenging it is to refer to what you individually assume are straightforward concepts - because different words mean different things to all us different Humpties, just as you say! Especially when you are talking about *experiences*.

Consequences are important to consider, particularly if there's a risk that other people will be directly affected without their consent, collaterally. Part of the purpose of this subreddit will be, I hope, to explore those issues too. There are practical, philosophical and *moral* implications here. Subjective idealism is not solipsism. If you are right-handed, do you happily use it to cut your left hand?

I think that so long as you don't explicitly target a person with your intentions, you're okay. Why would you pit aspects of yourself against one another anyway? It is true, however, that there is no filter: if you magickally intend something *it will happen in some form or other*, regardless of moral aspects and so on.

However, how 'the dream' manages and combines the different intentions of everyone into a single movement is of course interesting (if we view it that way). One of the simplest ways is to say that 'everything gets taken into account' from a timeless level perspective, but that's a little out of scope here.

Reply to “Open eye visualization to induce lucidity”

> [OP: In addition to lucid dreaming, i think getting really good at daydreaming can be very helpful in terms of breaking the boundaries of reality. Because i think when we dream or even lucid dream we can still create a kind of dualistic distinction in our minds of waking vs dreaming. When one can induce very vivid visualizations or day dreams one can look at both worlds at the same time, in a sense having one foot in the material and one in the astral. For example i was on my bike yesterday and i noticed a basketball. While riding i left the basketball behind but i imagined myself dribbling, i imagined feeling the texture of the ball, the weight of the ball, the smell of the ball and i tried to make myself feel like i was in two places at once, standing dribbling a ball and riding a bike. What also helps to make you daydreams more vivid is to make your waking perception less vivid, this can be done by having your eyes partially opened. So what i recommend is to meditate and pretend you are somewhere else, somewhere you can imagine vividly with all five senses. But the goal is not to completely immerse yourself in that visualization but to try to balance the vividness of your daydream and your waking experience so they are as close to equal as possible. When done successfully this seems to kill the distinction between real and imaginary when both of these experiences are at similar levels of vividness.]

You've just triggered a memory of the first book that got me interested in lucid-style dreams before I'd encountered the term, I'd completely forgotten about it until just now: David Fontana's *Meditator's Handbook: Comprehensive Guide*. Out of print now (the later version of the title doesn't have the same stuff), but it had exercises where you would practice each of your senses, and then attempt to create and enter a dream directly from the waking state, Tibetan Yoga style.

Exciting stuff, and basically what's accidentally happening with "dream insomnia"?

[...]

I think the subreddit summary covers it quite well. There's a bit of this in each of those topics, it just depends on what people are in it for - e.g. Buddhism for the bliss-out, occult for the rituals - but those people would get bored here pretty quickly and self-select out. Nothing wrong with the occasional materialist troll, if it leads us to explore and clarify our thinking or ability to communicate. (And, y'know, we can always let threads die.)

This is almost like "practical philosophy" rather than occultism/esoterica!

[...]

[The universe providing an illustration of your joiner-quality concerns.]

Reply to “The importance of magic in Oneirosophy”

Thoughts: 'This' shared dream works pretty much as our personal dreams do, it's just that it's a little more *sluggish*. It's been around a lot longer, and so has built up more established habits. Meanwhile, our personal dreams are usually created anew to some extent, and so haven't become entrenched.

Even if you don't deliberately intend, synchronicities are arising in alignment with your 'current direction'. You are always getting what you really, really want, or at least opportunities to do so. Until you 'intend' to change direction again. (Although we *can* interfere in moment-to-moment details, really it's the overall thing that is important.) This means that *magick is just how everything works, all the time, anyway.* **You don't even need a sigil; just a decision.**

(A further thought: If we were to take this seriously, perhaps then we'd have to shake the notion that we are 'located' in this world while we are off having dreams. It's more a case of us connecting or tuning in, but we have a default.)

Reply to “What's the biggest leap of faith into your own intentional creation of your reality that you've made?”

> Can I ask, how are you going about setting an intention? As best you can describe it.

Pretty much what I had in mind when I wrote the *Just Decide* post ages ago and the *Imagining That* one more recently, but I've always been wary of pushing a particular interpretation because (as you note) that can get in the way. It's hard to put into words without biasing it.

Our Lives... As If

If our experience is basically our imagination space then our lives work on a completely "as if" basis. Whatever you think appears immediately as a thought, and will trigger a sensory experience by association, just like triggering a memory - *but* filtered through the "facts" you have accepted. Any belief you have presents a hurdle or time-delay between the initial thought and the "auto-complete" of the rest of the memory.

However you imagine that it works, That's how it works. - TG

Think that you need to concentrate in order to get something? Then the world will act *as if* that were true. Think time is a real thing and that you have to wait a "reasonable period" for things? There you go.

Even worse, this happens by association and implication. Like you point out, *doing* stuff to make your wish happen *implies* that it's difficult and takes effort to achieve and so it will. If the world works on an "as if" basis, then "*acting* as if" creates restrictions by implication.

Just the facts, Ma'am

If you would truly perceive that this is just an imagination space with a mirage-like sensory image floating in it, then all "as if" restrictions would fall away. That's pretty difficult at this stage though, as you've accumulated many patterns, so the next best thing is to just not think about how things work at all. (In the background we might attend to seeing things as imagination, though, and perhaps clear ourselves out using a technique if we feel less confident.)

Your only task is then to decide what experiences you want to have. Either by selecting an exact moment you want to experience ("it is true *now* that this *will* happen *then*"), or by asserting more general *facts-of-the-world* that will inform subsequent moments ("it is true *now* that things always happen like *this*). More generally: "I will experience the world as if *this* were true."

Experience arises spontaneously and effortlessly. It does so in accordance with the facts-of-the-world you have accepted. Change the facts, change the experience. - TG

Using visualisation and so on is perfectly fine, so long as it's used simply to clarify or formulate the "decision". For instance, you might "decide" to have a new car. If we want a particular one, though, then specifying it via an image is not a bad idea.

Decisions, Decisions...

If all this is just us, there's nothing we can "do" anyway. Our experience consists entirely of "results". So effortless deciding is something we never actually experience ourselves doing, we only experience the *shift in the facts of the world* that we make. This takes no power whatsoever.

We are basically just reshaping ourselves, as ourselves.

It's mechanical, this whole process. We never directly change anything in the senses. We simply make decision and sensory experience subsequently falls into alignment with it, through the simply unfolding of patterns. But what *is* a "decision" in this context?

Creation by Implication

A decision is just a particular imagining which mechanically activates the extended pattern it is a part of, which then comes into sensory awareness. An example:

- I imagine an owl as vividly as I can. Subsequently, lots of random owl-based experiences arise.
- I "decide" that I'm going to see an owl at the zoo next Tuesday. Subsequently, I see an owl at the zoo that day.

Both operate in exactly the same way: an *imagining* is summoned which activates a pattern plus all its associated patterns (i.e. an extended pattern, like an auto-completed memory). The field of all possibilities is then filtered through this. In the first case, I've summoned the picture of an owl (basically saying: "owl!"), which is associated with the animal owl plus all imagery associated with that, plus notions of flight, feather, big eyes, and all sorts of more subtle linked ideas. Although I may only notice the main owl imagery, actually all of this will show up in my experience, because I haven't narrowed the specification. In the second case I have narrowed down my imagining to a more specific situation: a specific animal owl, in a specific place, at a specific time. Effectively I'm saying: "Seeing an owl in the zoo on Tuesday" and from that the larger pattern is activated. Because it is a pattern extended over time, I seem to experience it as "happening" but in fact I am simply having my attention pass across a pattern of moments.

We are using partial imagining to activate extended memories in awareness; The extended patterns then appear spontaneously as sensory experience. These patterns may be spread across time. - TG

EDIT: It's worth noting that even summoning just the "overall feel" of a situation is enough to trigger the pattern. Global Feel is a sensory experience and therefore imaginable also. More broadly still, summoning emotions will trigger experiences associated with that emotion; this is why "feeling gratitude" and "feeling energised" works for things like the so-called law of attraction. Having a general sense of happiness and wellbeing filters down the possible experiences to the ones associated with that.

Another takeaway from this is that *all manifestation is instant*. If things aren't happening for you, it's because you are subsequently undoing them before your attention reaches that moment (something you touched on).

> Effort != Action. Some things definitely do need some form of action.

Oh agreed. I probably need to emphasise a bit, "doing stuff to *make* your wish happen". Which is different to allowing actions to arise as *part* of your wish happening. The "letting go" aspect involves letting your mind and body be moved also, as part of the overall flow of the apparent world towards your goal.

> From my personal experience, there is some form of action involved in almost every manifestation.

Maybe it would be better to say, "some experience of body movement is involved in almost every manifestation".

From the *Just Decide* post: If you do some practice you can easily discover that you are not meant to push your body around by effort, by tensing up and forcing. It actually blocks progress. If you completely get out of the way, your body moves "by itself" along the lines of your intention. You don't have to *do* body movement; you get out of the way and allow an experience of movement to unfold.

But if you are actively asserting the contrary experience of *staying still and doing nothing*, suppressing movement, then obviously this won't happen.

The more towards "absolute allowing" you go, the more miraculously the world will fall in line, as you relinquish the limitations you have on what you are willing to let yourself experience. The potential "available routes" then increases.

> Because all of those things that the "conscious mind is aware of", are 100% based on the "sub-conscious beliefs & desires"

Right, it's all patterning and filtering. What gives you a result isn't what you do exactly; it's a process by which you have the desired experience come into awareness. Like the post suggests, what you actually want is *super-vivid, immersive remembering* - because that's what daily life really is. Which is quite an empowering idea, because you don't have to worry about some heavy, solid, material world "out there" that needs to shift and change via the laws of physics. You are just changing viewport, switching perspective, remembering something different...

> what you actually want is super-vivid remembering We already have it. But the issue is that its all filled with beliefs that are not helping us in any form.

For sure, our *desire* is already available to us as a situation that can be accessed, but we are only having a super-vivid experience if we are having it. We can get too nested here!

The concept behind the "remembering" metaphor is that the experience is already available, the corresponding event has in effect already happened, you just need to recall the memory. You are selecting experiences, you are not making events occur.

> But too much meditation may lead into a spiritual journey...

Which is a thing in itself. People who identify as spiritual seekers often have... a lifetime of experiencing seeking. Basically, by having that intention they are accidentally generating content and being distracted by it from what the content *arises within*. Lots of cool experiences, discoveries, insights and so on... most of which is just *more world*. Stopping seeking is the first step to discovery.

Here's a good question for you: what do you think about "other people"?

> I could see that the each & every person is unique in some form and they are more than I could understand from just my perception (or my model of them).

That's true. Maybe "model" was a poorly chosen word. They do reflect your outlook though; they do behave as aspects of you even when you just sit back and observe - "the way they are" seems to change in line with the "way you are"!

> Karma will eventually catch them in the next life. :P

Heh. Well, I believe that what you might call "momentum of intention" has an effect - I don't see it in the most traditional notion of karma though. Guess we'll find out later. Hopefully *much* later! :-)

> So nowadays I stopped interfering in the choice of others (because I'm interfering with their freewill)...

It's a good attitude to take. I don't think you *can* interfere with others' free will because the world isn't "simply shared" like that (I'll save you that explanation) - but just in terms of what kind of world you'd like to live in, direct manipulation doesn't seem like a good choice.

For sure, definitely help people if you can. Telling them won't do anything, by the way. However, you can "imagine them" into improved situations - provided you don't think that's interfering with their free will or karma, that is. ;-)

> It has to be *unconditional* loving-kindless and its easier said than to apply in life.

Right, because even if it seems to be directed at a person, it is actually going to the overall world you are experiencing - which is the same as directing it at yourself and all that you care for. I try and take a general view: ***What kind of world do I want to live in?***

Well, don't want to live in a world of people deserving things and receiving punishments in a cycle of retribution. I want to live in a world where everyone gets their chance and life is good.

What you are calling "karma" there, I would say is the truth of what Neville Goddard used to say:

"The world is yourself pushed out."

If you are depressed the whole world becomes depressing. If you are sneaky then the whole world takes on the personality of sneakiness. It's not just beliefs and intentions that shape the world. In fact, the more general truth is that it's your *entire character* that shapes the world - because there is no division. Internal and external both arise from you and are not separate, although in a way that is hard to describe!

> I think I really understand something to later find out, yes I was right, but I had no clue just how and in what exact ways I was right.

Yeah, this is so true.

[...]

[3man: 'If we are infinitely powerful, then what can effort possibly add to the outcome? Effort just confirms doubt.'; Brilliant.]

Reply to “Why is Oneirosophy Good?”

The extra part of it is the "magick" part. If you've had lucid dreams, you come to a different understanding of what influence or intention means, and what "you" are, and contemplation of what this all means in waking life leads to some interesting ideas.

Bits of this were brought up in other threads, but your notion of yourself becomes *everything that you are experiencing* or *that which experiences* and your notion of doing something - anything! - means *changing the universe*. You are performing magick every time you make a decision. What's more, the more you take on that worldview, the more it appears true.

And this is important. When you change your view to see waking life as a dream, it will become more like a dream for you, in all sorts of interesting ways. The expectation is that the further you push this, the more flexible things may become...

[...]

My interest in lucid dreaming also came and went, although has returned. I stopped fiddling with them in the end, more enjoyed the experience unfolding as an observer more; it became more of a philosophical playground.

Non-duality + chaos magick, perhaps as a summary, but the Crowley quote works for me. Flexibility in terms of free will for your own behaviour, for lifting boundaries for magickal work (what belief could be more flexible?), but primarily for clearer direct perception of the present moment perhaps.

Note: Of course, this is meant to be an exploratory sub for generating ideas as much as anything else - how far can you push this particular idea and what are the effects if you do? There is to be some fun involved.

> >Q: What do you mean by non-duality?

In its simplest form, the dissolving of the experience that you are 'here' and stuff is 'there'. It's a perceptual thing, rather than a thought thing. (Many-valued logic does look interesting though. I've heard the sea battle paradox before.)

> > Q: That's kind of what I was asking you! I'm not sure why direct "perception of the present moment" is desirable.

Maybe it'll just be really cool? ;-) Increased freedom of will would *follow* from clearer perception, I suggest. But the real point of this sub (which isn't mine actually, it just looks interesting) seems to be a question or two, not an answer: *what would it be like...? what would it mean philosophically...?*

Well, the extra question is... *what can you do if you make this a dream?* If you adopt that belief so completely that you experience it, as in chaos magick. Well, let's hope so!

Indeed. All to be explored. Or... not, depending.

This is interesting though. What are your concerns about this approach?

> > Q: Well, the main one is that you might not be able to reverse any undesirable changes you make to yourself. The higher order problem is of knowing what one should use these techniques for. In many

> eastern religions, these techniques are used to attain something called "enlightenment," whose nature varies from culture to culture. But essentially, the goal is to be happy, or at least to avoid suffering, and in Buddhism, this is largely accomplished through not feeling attached to things. Unfortunately, if we think about the character of the person who is merely content, and does not care about anything, does that seem like a "good" person. I certainly don't like being around those people, and don't want to be like that.

It is true that changes would be irreversible, even just because of the memory of the change.

Enlightenment, as I see it, isn't about being happy (although that may come), it's about realising there is no division between you and your environment, that there is no "you" as you conceive of it - rather, you are "the space in which experience arises". This is different to not caring or being content. In fact, it doesn't necessarily reflect on your character at all! There are plenty of grumpy, smoking, drinking enlightened people. Rather, it is simply seeing *what you actually are*. This then leads to experiential subjective idealism, and from then to a more direct approach to magick. Is the idea.

Reply to “Clarifying a few things.”

> [cosmicprankster420 (OP): Alright so some readers here are still not fully clear on what the idea of Oneirosophy is, and maybe there are a few things i didn't explain. A few people mentioned how they don't understand how it is more than just lucid dreaming or feeling like this is a lucid dream. The importance of this feeling of lucidity is recognizing that this very well may be a dream right now (I believe that, but i'll let you decide for yourself) and that if this is a dream then it can most definitely be changed with magic. In HP lovecrafts short story Celephais there is a part in the story when Kuranes is exploring the dream lands that he comes to a place outside of what he calls infinity inhabited by intelligent glowing colored gases that study the secrets of existence. This is the kind of place Oneirosophy takes you in that realizing the dream like nature of existence you are in fact stepping outside of conventional reality into a place where the talking purple gas clouds live.
>
> The reason it is a practice is because although one can claim to be a subjective idealist on an intellectual level they may still have materialist habits and thought patterns at the unconscious level. By blurring the line between waking and dreaming and achieving lucidity this mindset becomes integrated at a more fundamental level emotionally and experiencially rather than just conceptually. When this is integrated successfully there is a feeling of peace as well as a sense of courage to do things one was normally afraid of doing. And like Nefandi said somewhere its not just about making the dream world seem real but making the real world seem more dream like.]

This is good. Yes, **the point is to recognise that this actually is a dream. And not just to think it or recognise it intellectually, but to feel the truth of this in your moment to moment experience.** And (magickally speaking) what could be more flexible than a dream?

Reply to “This is something I am contemplating currently: Stability.”

> Q: In other words, intent, I now realize, has a clearly effortless aspect. I would even say that true intent, deepest intent, is always effortless.

Yes, I completely agree with this. I wonder, is the "replacement grounding" required for a sense of stability possibly the consistent sense of identifying with background awareness, rather than any other aspects of personality or objects or whatever? If everything else is going to be changeable and transitory, all that's going to be left is that background; it'll be the only thing to hold on to.

> Q: I haven't tried thinking of making background awareness my home base precisely because it doesn't look like anything, it's like I don't know what it is...

I think its property of "always there-ness' despite having no form is why it's potentially good for grounding / identifying with, whereas intent is content (loosely) and so changes.

> Q: In one dream I've had my legs cut off and I didn't even blink... I've had dream environments disappear or drastically change...

But, you did know you were in a literal dream (i.e. lucid dream) at the time. Your ("real") body screams for its existence when it gets in danger; you'd be amazed how much it likes being alive (as we judge it). I have in the past assumed I would get to a stage where i'd not care, but then went beyond it and was surprised how... well... *fighty* it all is!

> Q: I still like intent better. :)

You can have both, because the content is made from / shaped from the background. So it's more a case of focus, I guess. Anyway, it's something to play with.

[...]

What's the "subconscious"? Surely just a "space" we're not attending to in this context, I'm thinking.
No effort is involved.

> Q: And my mind can fill in the details without explicit instruction. That's one way to explain what subconscious is.

For that, I disagree a little. You saying "my mind" implies a separation between a "you" and your mind. You're summoning the thought of a meadow seeds that form in your mind, as mind, I'd say. You are "rippling yourself". Edward de Bono used to write a lot about creativity, and how partial stimulation of a visual idea would "pop" the full form into your mind; it's a bit like that I'd say. Our mind (language eh!) already has structure and form, um, *enfolded* with in it. That's my best stab for now. *It's a creative autocomplete process, assisted by expectation.* Maybe?

The other approach is really interesting and different, some stuff to think about there. I don't believe there is a subconscious. I think it's just a term for the existence "bits of experience" that you aren't looking at, mixed in

with accounting for the appearance of "bits of experience" when you don't have the sense of creating them yourself. Kind of the same thing, really. (The latter arising because although you can experience *creation*, you *can't experience yourself creating* as such, not as a "doer".)

> Q: Doh. I didn't mean that literally.

Yeah, that wasn't quite my point. I meant more that you don't really "do" it, but you don't need a "subconscious" to do it for you either.

> Q: There is no super-order in my view.

The idea is that the levels aren't really separate, or spatial levels. It's about an increasing granularity, with each level of granularity being of increasing dimensions. (Explicate or zero order is "this" in 3D, next level is a grid of all this, and then so on.) The shortcut is: everything is here, now, folded in the place/space you are experiencing. It's easier to just jump to that, but the levels let you picture accessing it.

> Q: But it's a damn useful term...

Agreed. It's a shorthand and saves you and I writing a five-paragraph explanation of everything when you just want to make a simple point! :-)

Extra bit. Reaching down through the implicate orders is also the path for reaching from your *localised* experience to the *unbounded* experience. That "open vast place" feeling being the root.

> Q: Can you explain what is being negated here, exactly?

That when I initially read it, it was as if your "subconscious" was off doing things for you on your behalf, but that's not how I see it happening myself.

> Q: I like this shortcut, personally.

Me too, once you're there. But if you you start from "what we see around us", this is the process to get from here to there, in steps, and combined the mind/body problem. Of course, it's a 10-page quantum physics/philosophy paper! I mean, I'm not encouraging us to think of levels all the time, you can just skip to "everything is enfolded and accessible now" for practical purposes.

> Q: This almost sounds like a meditation practice or a visualization practice.

Well, you effectively did it in your post earlier today when describing your present moment experience - just feel the unstructured openness... just consciousness eh.

> Q: How do you see it happening? Can your mind do anything automatically?

It comes back to the enfolded patterns thing, with Edward de Bono's idea of mind as a self-organising system. Effectively, you are "activating" a pattern into being unfolded, by intention. A partial movement leads to a complete wave, just as when you see the corner of an object peeking out from behind an obstruction, you 'auto-complete' it to the whole thing.

> Q: That seems like a very difficult way to get there. There are easier ways.

Sure, but you have to remember this comes from the starting point of joining mind and matter together into one outlook. We don't need to do that, we can jump straight to subjective idealism, but that wasn't a given, especially not for a physicist.

> Q: Then all you need to do is mount a philosophical attack on matter, and get it out of the way.

Right, exactly. This is what he was doing, but beginning with matter as described in the standard way in quantum physics, then building on that to get to mind-matter unity and then enfolded limitless possibility. You build from the field you're in, to get there. That's why he got into dialogues with Krishnamurti - who arrived at the same point but from the other direction: observation of the senses, contemplation, then conclusion.

> Q: Well, the unstructured openness is behind the stuff I was talking about.

Yes.

> Q: The unmanifest context is the context of infinite latent potential.

They are the same thing. The "openness" has infinitely small granularity within it, it's the most subtle level possible; everything is enfolded into it. This is why it is an unstructured "space": it is infinitely dimensioned and no-dimensioned. There are no distances. It is "all one thing" - and since objects only exist relative to and in contrast to non-objects, it is "non-sensible. One thing cannot be perceived as an object relative to itself...

Until, of course, it *folds in on itself* to provide internal contrast, like waves in the water or a folds in a blanket. First space, then objects. (That's why enfolded/unfolded, implicate/explicate comes about.)

> Q: How is this different from what I was saying? I must be missing something. It sounds like you're disagreeing, but when I ask you about it, you describe what to me sounds like the same thing, but in different words.

It's not! That's what I said a comment or two back. We were saying the same thing it turned out, I'd just slightly misread you at first.

> Q: I see. Well, I am not a physicist. Maybe that explains things?

Well, it just shows you can come at it from different angles, and it all leads to the same place. We get to pick the imagery that makes most sense to us. I'm more of the philosophy side myself.

Mathematics: It's just pattern description. Anything where there's a pattern, you can use mathematics. And since if something isn't a pattern we can't perceive it or experience it, we funnily enough find that maths seems strangely "matched" to our experience. Which is nice.

> Q: I agree! But it is knowable. In fact, that openness you talk about can be called omniscience, and we can say that the mind is inherently omniscient.

Yes, and every mind does know it, we just "forget" it, because we narrow our focus onto the unfolded objects. It is completely knowable, in the fundamental sense: to "know" something is to become it, to *be* it, to recognise you *are* it.

> Q: Interesting. It seems like QM and physics in general has had a huge influence on how you think.

Well, it's where I started, but it was the philosophy of 'what is' that interested me. A gravitational field? *What is a field really?* And so on. There are lots of handy reusable metaphor patterns in science. After all, that's the whole basis of it: abstracting nice pictures from muddy, complicated observations to explain them better. Much as we're doing.

As you dig deeper though, you find yourself back on the surface, with ideas that can be shared all around.

> Q: There is also stuff like taste...

And *feeling*. Hmm. Maths seems to be *visual* patterning at its origin, even if it is then extended to undrawable dimensions, because individual 'mathematical objects' that interact can each be multi-dimensional patterns. You can draw a representation of sound, because it can be generalised. *Chunking* - that's a spot on observation. One difficult thing with science - or rather *scientism* - at present is that it discounts those things which don't fit into its observational/experimental limits. Can't count it? Can't draw it? No go.

> Q: So what is a field really?

Nothing dramatic there. It's a "what if?" construction. **Extended metaphor alert!**

Imagine a literal field: a square area of grassy land. I get my paintbrush an draw a grid on it. I now pick up my football, and go to the corner of the first square (vertex, where the lines cross over) and lay the ball on it. I note how quickly the ball rolls away and in which direction. I paint a number and a little arrow on the corner. Repeat for all vertices. I stand on a nearby hill and take a photograph. I now have a picture that answers the question: "what would happen if I put a football on this particular location on that land?". Now, if I saw there was a pattern in the numbers and directions - say, because the land sloped in one direction - I might be able to write an equation that captures the whole picture. That way I don't need to look up my grid of numbers individually, I can just type the location into the equation and get the answer straight away. Then I find that other bits of land with, say, the same colour of grass on it all show the same trend. Well, I can now use my equation as a general approach for all land with "blue grass" on it. I don't even need to go do the grid thing: tell me the size of the land with blue grass on it, I can tell you what will happen to a football placed on a particular location on that land, from the comfort of my computer screen.

That's all a field is. A descriptive "what if?" pattern, or an equation which captures that pattern in convenient form.

> Q: Yea, basically they have to either deny or ignore qualia.

Hmm, yeah. A more honest is approach is to say, "it lies outwith our limits to study, at present". There are some concepts that are just in different "spaces". We could unify the brain and the mind by saying "the brain is the image of the personal mind that someone sees when looking from the outside", but you can't study 1st Person experience from a 3rd Person perspective and have direct equivalence.

[...]

Well, I did say. :-) But then, what does it mean to have a *morphic field* in that case, in which forms or habits are encoded? Or a field of possibilities? Basically the same, but multi-multi-dimensional. Just like our enfolded/latent ideas from before.

> Q: Not in a million years. The brain is just an appearance (pattern) inside the mind. It's impossible to confuse the two... When I am looking at your brain from a 3rd person perspective, I am actually not looking at your mind. I am still only looking at your brain.

You are not even doing that though. The idea (I'm not necessarily with, I must say, it's just a proposal that has been made) is that since everything you experience is an idea, an image, a metaphor - then looking at a "brain" and detecting patterns is, in your world-dream, a 'metaphor' or image representation of a person's localised mind.

>Q: This is slightly different from what you're saying, but...

That works. In other words, the brain "image" represents certain "aspects" of the unfolded experience of the person being observed? We hit a bit of intersubjectivity stuff here I suppose, but that's okay, I think it holds. Extended persons.

Yes. It is a representation "in some way". The more we look, the more we may create an association. *Discovery* is often *creation in action*. Whenever we seek an explanation, we usually find one - opening the door in a lucid dream!

Reply to “On being human, whats up with that?”

I've taken the 'non-human' stuff to be more in the spirit of "self-realisation" - i.e. that your true nature is not a person, but the things that is aware of being a person. You *have* humanity, but **fundamentally what you really are is not a *human*.** You might consider that more of an expanding-out though. But then, **all the same things follow from that.**

[...]

"Self love" does get a bad rap in some corners, especially recently eh...

> Q: they confuse it with narcissism, which to me narcissism is actually self lust not self love.

Or fapping... I see narcissism as compulsive *self-defence*.

Reply to “Visualization within the manifest context region of experience.”

> Q: So the important thing here is to *feel* and not just think.

And that is the magic key: to avoid *thinking-about*, which just creates images *about* things (ideas), and instead to use *direct sensing*, to explore what's *there*. Creation vs discovery. (Although what is discovered was once created, of course.)

We tend to think of visualising and imagining as something we do in a special 'imagining place', but there is only one 'place' really, where our sensory experience and our thoughts all appear, even though sometimes there seem to be different parallel/simultaneous 'spaces' within that place.

You can stretch out your 'feeling' forever in the 'sensory space' (manifest) or contract it or bend it. It's a completely non-physical space after all, made entirely from 'mind'. Depending on your view, sensory experience may or may not be 'inspired by' an underlying something, but that doesn't really matter. Because there's definitely no "matter" in your experience. You can overlay anything into the sensory space, or you can have 'parallel spaces' and put imagery in there creatively, or connect to other existing imagery - which might expand into a direct lucid dream if you focus in on it.

> Q: Ultimately there is something we can call "basic space"...

I label it as a "place" rather than a "space" because the latter term implies a three-dimensional structure or grid in which things arise. When you 'feel out' you find that it's more of an "unstructured openness", and structured spaces appear within that. As in, "space" is itself an object-like thing. It also makes it easier to talk of different "spaces" whose locations are undefined (e.g. you are sat at home in your kitchen but imagining a tree; the location of the "tree" is often not really exactly located anywhere in the "kitchen space" until you make it so; it's in its own "space" elsewhere).

The "spaces" notion also allows different versions of experiences to coexist, because they are not *located* with reference to each other.

> Q: But some people will probably feel like matter sort of draws your mind to itself...

Yeah. Apparent-material interaction take precedence because they're our 'ground level' I suppose - they're the "frame" for the rest of our experiences. Just as we often assume we *are* our thoughts and body because they are the most persistent, most unchanging part of our experience, so we assume this *is* the world because it is relatively stable and unchanging relative to dream-spaces and their content.

Reply to “Investigation of the utility of dream manipulation”

The idea is here is that your dream and waking life are a *continuity* - both consist of 'dream images' with no hidden underlying solid substrate - appearing in the common background of your awareness. What they *are* beyond that is another thing, of course. Certainly, lucid dreams can be great for rehearsal and a host of other brilliant applications, as well as exploring your 'base'. However, fundamentally the hope is that you might be able to apply your lucid dreaming abilities more readily to waking life (in a "magickal" sense) than is commonly assumed, if you truly accept subjective idealism and operate from it. An additional benefit (for some, the key benefit) is a recognition of your true nature and place in the world, and the nature of that world, as a 'good' in itself.

I think 'secret agnosticism' isn't a bad thing either. Thing thing is, 'waking life' does act "as if" there is a background, but it turns out to be flexible: it does adjust to your beliefs and expectations and intentions. Since 'dream world' is the most flexible possible approach, and the most relaxed approach, that is to the benefit. In a way, it's much like magick traditions that all, in the end, teach you to work on yourself and reach 'realisation'. The world does seem to *try* to respond "as if". There's no such thing as a servitor as such, but the world will respond to you as if there were.

The difference between the waking world and the dream world is really the depth of the establishment of *habits*. The waking world has been around a lot longer than any dream you're going to have, and has stabilised. It is still potentially semi-unlimited (it is just mind-imagery) though. However, the 'will' or confidence or commitment-to-worldview required to make things happen is much greater. Hence the 'Dream Yoga' style effort (if you've not read Tenzin Rinpoche's book, it's worth your time, and is "available").

I understand your 'objections' though. Also, something that occurred was, all waking imagery is essentially symbolic too; it represents "meaning".

[...]

> [[**AesirAnatman**: What you don't realize is that you never actually wake up. Your dream just changes form.
>
> All hallucinations are totally malleable. The only thing standing in your way is your own desire to hold on to the hallucination.
>
> *“it is a bit of leap to assume that the only thing stopping you is desire to hold on to the hallucination.”*; **Only if you believe in a material world**
>
> *“how does it immediately follow that desire is the only element involved in manipulating hallucinations?”*; **All hallucinations are in the mind, like a dream.** A dream is something you manifest with your mind. You make a dream, even if you aren't self-conscious enough to realize it or take advantage of it.
>
> *“Might there be hallucinations that we do not desire, but seem to arise nonetheless?”*; Not ultimately
>
> *“Do the thoughts of others influence our own thoughts?”;* No, your thoughts are totally free. I've created you to have free thoughts.

> *“Do we interact with others at all?”*; Yes and no.
>
> *“Berkely, for example, (a well known subjective idealist) thought that God was all-seeing, and thus kept "unreality" stable.”*; Berkeley wasn't actually a subjective idealist in his bones. He still wanted an objectivity and couldn't give it up, so he created an objective god. His god was in his mind if he believed in it and was thus real for him subjectively, but not for those who don't believe. Berkeley maintained objectivity and materiality with his god.
>
> *“anything goes, and there is no-thing to be obtained or lost.”*; Precisely.]]

Some good points. "The rope and the snake", for instance?

And, certainly, it doesn't follow that belief/expectation are the only things at work. If this is, say, a 'shared dream' then there's more to it than your personal belief. As I say elsewhere, one difference between waking and most dreaming is the longer-lasting nature of this waking world, and it's potential to have amassed 'habits'. I say "this" because this is the 'default' world we seem to return to. In fact, it might be better to call this our 'base dream'. I'd say there is *no difference* to the way waking and dream realities are built and behave, but it might be that dreams build up 'habits' and 'solidity' (really: predictability and self-consistency) over time. And since our base dream is longer lasting with more active dream characters, it has stabilised to a great extend. This is why most magick seems to occur via 'useful coincidences', even if incredibly unlikely. It is rare to directly observe a discontinuity occurring.

Is reality consensual? Berkeley's problem is that he implicitly imagined that there was in a sense a three-dimensional space, but the people in it were only observing certain areas of that space - and that things outwith anyone's observation might 'go blank'. However, there is no such 3-d space. If you examine your own experience, you'll find that there seems to be a "vast unstructured place" where your experience arises. Within that, you experience a 'phenomenal space", a structured space with sensory experience, and other parallel 'ideational spaces' where thoughts are (although sometimes they might seem to be located in the 'phenomenal space' somehow). The alternative view is that the whole world is *enfolded into* the perspective you are seeing now, and moments *unfold then enfold* into the background one by one. That way, the whole world is always under observation, or 'within mind', and nobody is 'spatially located'; everyone is everywhere or rather, everywhere is within everyone.

Summary: There are some things that need to be understood by experimentation and contemplation.

The enfolded/unfolded idea is well described in physicist David Bohm's world-view of an explicate (what we see) and implicate (which is enfolded) order.

The hologram analogy applies to a limited extent: if the whole image is contained within each part of the image, then looking at any part of the image at all is to look at the whole - this fulfilling the requirement that the world must exist within consciousness at all times (= be "observed" in the most general sense).

I'm pretty flexible on interpretations; to an extent it comes down to "practicality". However, I am keen on a *commonality* of viewpoint between dreaming and waking, intention and magick, which I think is achievable.

> Q: Also, I don't why thoughts can't have nonspatial dimensions to them that we reinterpret into spatial dimensions.

We do have an ability to *think-about*. For instance, under hypnosis people can experience "square circles" and so on, because you are not necessarily bound by visual and dimensional restrictions. (You don't need to by hypnotised, you can just do this, but you'll find yourself reluctant to let go to it.)

> Q: It is not clear that the Buddhist notion of emptiness is equivalent to "lack of substance."

I've always taken this to be that there is *no solid underlying*. That the world is an illusion not because it is not a real experience, it is just that the *nature* of that experience is not what we assume.

One examines the cup of coffee before us, and realises that it has no solidity: it is a floating image, with occasional other sensations when we 'touch' it, but nowhere can we find the 'solid cup of coffee' we imagine. Then we turn our attention to ourselves, and find that *we* are not solid either: empty space with the occasional sensation floating here and there! That's my understanding at present anyway.

Buddhism seems quite 'scientific' in some of its forms, in the same sense as this. It seems to have a 'practical' aspect that works with its flexibility. In truth, with idealism there is nothing to say that there isn't an underlying 'X' that 'inspires' our sensory experience, it is just inaccessible and cannot be commented upon. It has to be inferred by the restrictions and limitations we observe. In that sense they cover the same ground.

Reply to “Videos of the siddhis”

Always interesting. But I wish the videos were more complete. For instance, I'd like to see the paper selected from a random stack of paper, then held up, then the burnings (so nothing was placed on it beforehand, chemicals etc activated by motion or time). I'd like to see the lighter taken from someone's pocket, then placed on the floor, then move (so nothing was connected to it, or underneath it, nothing unusual about it).

Why not levitate the lighter rather than just move it sideways? That's what I'd do. Why not control the bull more directly, summon it to me? Why not ignite the paper at the edges, where it was being held by those guys' fingers? That would be far more fun. :-)

Otherwise there are other ways to do those things, and they can just be parlour tricks. He's not very impressively critical, unfortunately, a bit of a gee-whiz enthusiast from the start. Sometimes magic (sans "k") tricks are ways to promote a movement whose real power is mostly invisible (healings and so on). I remain open. There are plenty stories of monks and everyday people having siddhi-like experiences though, and people who have no bias in this area but have pursued 'realisation' report that "they do come".

> *“One of the side diversions of this whole thing, is at a certain stage to cultivate the siddhis, powers, that do come with the seeing of who one is - and they do come.”*

I just wish we'd catch the good stuff on video properly...

[...]

> > Q: This kind of stuff is easy to doubt if you want to.

One should start with doubt, and work from there, in these cases. It's part of the show this one; it has "drama". (Particularly if seen in full context.) Just as he's landing during the fade-out, the bottom of the wall seems to move a little, for instance. And you'd keep the camera still and on him all the time if it were really an 'investigation'. (Anyone who could do this for real would be a fool to do it publicly.)

The usual 'real versions' of things are always less dramatic, more like glitches or reality shifts. No gestures should be required for magick, only intention. Gestures are just to persuade yourself. Or for fun. *Direct right-now manipulation*, there's not much of it. Gestures in public performance are for misdirection and showmanship, for entertainment or promotion.

Aside: It's amazing to watch an expert at work - e.g. Derren Brown doing quite simple card tricks on camera where you can see exactly what he's doing if you look (view *first* then read brackets if interested). The 'Smoke' trick and 'Card Prediction' trick. In the former, though, Stephen Fry does seem to do something odd himself, just after lighting up...

Reply to “Confessions”

On Fearlessness

Hmm. How to assist this state? One of the benefits of recognising that you are not 'this body' but are the whole dream should be the recognition that the whole dream moves with you towards your goals? And that apparent fears are anxieties arising from not completely embracing that viewpoint. This may have a side-effect though: That any efforts of manipulation that imply that 'you' are separate from 'the environment' might reinforce a materialist view of stubborn not-me resisting change.

Another approach to releasing fears can be to simply to do a daily exercise where you lie down on the floor and just leg go of yourself, body and thought - basically, "play dead" and let things move and unwind by themselves. You'll find that a lot of fear is held as 'defensive tension' in the body with co-located thoughts and feelings. They gradually release and work themselves out over time if given the chance.

[...]

It's initially a bit daunting and can be unpleasant though: all your defences are being deleted/released, after all. The process is usually relatively gradual overall but can be very "bumpy" - as in, things might be quiet for a while and then there's a big release.

The thing is, it *is* scary. You are opening yourself out to "become the universe" - it's the thing all those non-dual and buddhist efforts lead to: identifying yourself with the wide open space of awareness and all its contents. As soon as you do it, you become aware of all those bits and pieces you have generally been avoiding. And you just feel completely *exposed*. I guess that's why there's much talk of "faith" and so on. You only realise how hard you are holding on when you try to let go like this.

People who start doing mindfulness, for instance, are often surprised to discover they feel a bit *worse* when they begin! But then those feelings dissolve into the surrounding space. There's an interesting book by Les Fehmi called *Dissolving Pain* which has techniques for this; they are applicable here too. In fact, lots of magick/help approaches essentially boil down to the same thing.

There's a book called *Busting Loose From The Money Game* by Robert Scheinfeld basically written as a business self-help book, but in actual fact it's based around a "process" of dissolving "discomfort eggs" as they arise and releasing their energy. In other words, mindfulness and dissolving your reality into openness.

> Q: "become the universe" .. It's beyond that even.

Yep, so language update: From now on, let's have "universe" mean "all the objects (content)" and "place" or "ground" of awareness be the vastness with all its enfolded infinite possibilities. We're talking about the same thing.

> Q: But what's interesting is that there are ways to express the same thing that will make people slightly afraid and recoil. And ways that will make people giddy with fun and joy.

Yes. It's a lesson to learn: when you talk to people about this stuff, you have to begin from *their* worldview and build outwards, leading step by step. That's why there are so many, *need* to be so many*, ways of saying the same thing.

> Q: I don't like this, because it tries to homogenize possibilities.

How does it? We say that "you" are the open infinity, and the "universe" is the temporary objects and processes and observations arising within it.

> Q: Only in your mind. Your level of expression hides too much. Fuck people over with insight! Slam them with truth. Maybe not always, but sometimes.

Heheh. But the thing is, they *won't understand you* if you don't start from their current concepts! I don't mean you start by *agreeing* with them, only that you begin with their terms of reference.

> Q: Eh, the word "world" again implies internal consistency...

A "world" does appear to have those things, like a "dream-world" but it's easier to think of it being illusory, and "hanging in space". Or I find it easier anyway. You can literally sit people down and say, 'what do you see?" and then show them that their current experience is limited and sits inside a vast open place.

I mean, all this depends on who you're talking to of course!

Of course, I'm only teaching myself! They are, of course, not so much "inside a vast open space" as rather "inside *me*"...

Ha. Well, lack of confidence in my ability to communicate it, perhaps. This may indeed be true. But in both ways!

To understand *and* be understood. :-)

It's a trade-off that you can balance out later. Not so the other way. But, yeah, it's something worth considering, particular with non-face-to-face discussion.

Reply to “Maintaining an attitude and a frame of mind of a Deity.”

So, key to this I'd say is **expanding your identity to cover the whole universe.** You dissolve your commitment to the solidity of the content, but recognise the *ground* of the universe to be yourself. To dissolve your personal history is important. It is present within your current experience right now, and seeds it, as you indicate.

There are exercises and other experiments people can do for this sort of thing (some mindfulness-related, some about updating your imagination, some about revising your past by replaying it and editing it). Everyone has their own approach.

> Q: No, the universe is too limiting of an identity.

Okay, I used "universe" to mean "that which contains everything" there. So that vast, infinite unbounded space for me is the universe, or "me". Alternatively, I could have said that the universe is the 'content' (all objects) and I am that which the universal content arises within. Same thing. We need *some* word to use.

> Q: Sure is. I even put one exercise that you suggested into a wiki for this reddit.

Okay, good. Well, maybe tweak it up and people can think of what they'd like to contribute. Personal experience, plus: There are lots of books where there's one exercise or little snippet - e.g. the Neville Goddard approach, there's a good exercise or two for undoing your past in Reichian stuff, whatever - and it can save people actually tracking down and reading whole things if we can just cut to the important bit.

> Q: How about mind?

Hmm, 'mind' is a problem because it's commonly used to mean "the place where personal thoughts are". Don't really want to say "mind of God". We've played with calling it "vast unstructured place" where a "phenomenal space" appears (sensations) and/or "ideational spaces" (dreams, thoughts) appear without necessarily being spatially connected, all that. But that's too involved.

What are others? The "ground of being" or "the ground", "infinite awareness", "underlying consciousness'? Is there something that sounds more, well, solid and practical?

> Q: I think it is a mistake to think that this is what mind is. Mind contains all of reality. . .

That's very nicely written. I agree, but it is true that your everyday person thinks of *a* mind: theirs.

> Q: . . . once common misconceptions about them have been eliminated.

Yes. "Mind" does have the benefit of not having the sense of a restricted space or structure, and implies awareness/consciousness of course.

I've seen "Mind-At-Large" used to try and encapsulate this, but actually if you clarify that mind isn't divided and supports perspectives, it seems misleading, since it implies a spatial divide between different individual minds.

Anyway, when it comes down to it this is about how *we* refer to it in this forum. I wonder whether if it might be an idea to have a post which clarifies the "picture of reality" we're using, with terminology. (I say this even though I dismissed the call for a "terms of reference" post a while back.)

[...]

The trick of "waking up to the moment" as if you've just been dumped here is good for this.

> “Imagine you’ve spent the last ten million years in a formless, detail-less void, with no way to see, taste, or touch anything. But luckily you’ve won some sort of cosmic lottery and your prize is to be plucked from that void and dropped into a real, breathing moment. Real warmth on your skin, real breath in your lungs, real people speaking, real music, real trees.
>
> ...aaaand thunk! There you are in this chair, in this room.
>
> Look around. Wherever you are right now, know that you’ve just been dropped into this moment, having been previously sequestered from life and existence. Any notion you have of your past is just a story. Believe that story if you want (I suggest tossing it) but what happens here doesn’t depend on it.
>
> The important thing to know is that you’ve been given another chance to really experience life. Right now. Look down and you’ll see you’ve been assigned a physical body, which is under your control, along with the miraculous faculties of sight, hearing, touch and more. Maybe it can’t do everything, but can do a hell of a lot. You are surrounded by tools, clothing, supplies, friends and allies to employ as you see fit. There are no goals, other than what you decide. There are no obligations, other than what you find to be in your best interest.
>
> You have never been here before. Welcome to the playground.”
>
> - Raptitude, “How to Keep Life Fresh, For Free”

Also, you need to bear in mind that if **you *are* a deity-like figure**, you may have made some decisions prior to current appearance that you are now unaware of. You may have set some stuff up, a bit of a path or whatever, that restricts your complete freedom to some degree.

Reply to “On timelessness and age.”

[cosmicpranksster420: it seems a lot of humans get worked up over the concept of age, how long ones meat body has been in operation. Something i have pondered is the idea of being timeless or eternal, not defining ones self by their age. For some reason my birthday is coming up in a month and today i was mildly distressed about turning 27 mainly because i haven't accomplished that much in the material world in terms of jobs and mates and so forth. Even though i have graduated college and have a completed fantasy novel manuscript, there are so many ways this golf score we call our age binds us to the material world and reduces lucidity.

In addition to not associate with being human, i've began to realize what makes us humaned or what binds us to the material world is the ticker of age, this scoreboard that defines our worth in this materialistic society. Associating ourselves with our age seems to make us hyper aware of our physical human bodies, and i believe i want to transcend that by not identifying with my age and instead think of myself as eternal, timeless, outside of time, never born. When that ticker becomes insignificant it seems much harder to be attached to this particular dimension and harder to associate ones self with being human. Why should our dream be defined by a score we call age, i just came here to play the game and have fun. If we move the metaphor from dream to video game, its like materialists are those gamers who get way to frustrated in world of war craft and associate their self worth with there score in the game, when being lucid makes you say "dude, its just a game, chill out".]

[AesirAnatman: I'm glad you posted this.

It's interesting because about a week ago I was asked by some document I was filling out how old I am. I sat there for a good minute asking myself 'am I 22 or 23? I'm not sure' until I did the math for the years and figured it out. I realized that conventionally this is a very weird question to ask myself. Age doesn't matter much to me because I've stopped identifying and caring about that aspect of my humanity. This extends beyond occasional forgetfulness of my own age - I never remember the ages of my friends or family or their birthdays. Stranger yet, when I interact with children or elderly people, I basically treat them as I would anyone else. I don't baby children (and often have ended up bringing out incredibly intelligent aspects of kids simply by treating them as such) and I don't try to appease the elderly. Granted, this isn't entirely true with me with the elderly members of my own family at present, but is basically true otherwise.

“there are so many ways this golf score we call our age binds us to the material world and reduces lucidity.”; YES. Right now I'm trying to learn to live ultra-minimally so that I can live in a van in order to not need to work very much. However, I'm still going to school for a CS and Philosophy degree in order to pursue a career even though I have no desire or intention to have such a career more than 2-3 years max. I want to have graduated college, with no particular benefit to myself.

“i believe i want to transcend that by not identifying with my age and instead think of myself as eternal, timeless, outside of time, never born.”; I feel this desire as well.

> "*its like materialists are those gamers who get way to frustrated in world of war craft and associate their self worth with there score in the game, when being lucid makes you say "dude, its just a game, chill out".*"; Hahaha, I feel this way so often.]

Good post. @cosmicprankster420 & @AesirAnatman:

Bringing the magickal aspect into this though: If not *things*, or a career, there are *experiences* we'd like to have, I guess? And situations we'd like to be in, and situations we'd like *not* to be in.

There are two approaches, and I reckon making the decision early as possible is best:

- *With Plan:* You can select what you want and start adopting it as your reality now (magickal techniques; Neville Goddard; etc). This is the Deity Dreamer approach: This is all your reality, under the control of your imagination.
- *Without Plan:* You can commit to staying relaxed and open and paying attention, deciding that you will always follow your intuition and the synchronistic opportunities that arise, *no matter how you feel*. This is the 'True Will' approach, or rephrased: that you already always know what you want in ways that you can't consciously think, but you'll know when to act when the time comes. Intentional purposelessness.

Either one is a form of commitment and works. Half-baked versions of either mean you just get bounced about. I've jumped between the two, and it confused things. (In college days I spent loads of time *thinking and reading* about relaxation, self-mastery, philosophy and magick and not them putting them into *consistent* daily practice and exercise or really paying attention to what I actually wanted, flip-flopping. I could have saved myself a lot of messing about.)

> > Q: i believe i want to transcend that by not identifying with my age and instead think of myself as eternal, timeless, outside of time, never born.

That's great. However, you have to recognised that you *will* have the *experience* of being a particular bodily age and so on as 'time' unfolds, and you should plan to deal with that, in terms of what you 'intend' and the situation you want to be in. Better to be in that nice house with a pool and staff, than not.

> > Q: "dude, its just a game, chill out".

If only there was a handy strategy guide!

I mean, it's always going to be better to: a) be a millionaire before 30/35/40 whatever than not, and b) to start doing things you love, with money coming from that, sooner rather than later. And if you're not *really* interested in CS/Phulosophy or want a career in it, but really want to be an actor, then do that now - etc. Otherwise you'll never get the $10M blockbuster action movie payday while you're still young enough to pull the moves and the ladies*. :-)

The materialism/idealism, waking/dreaming, reality/illusion philosophy or practice doesn't really change any of that, since they are about *experiences*. Whether you do it by old-fashioned means or by magick, you still have to make *the choice*.

> [Utthana: “i believe i want to transcend that by not identifying with my age and instead think of myself as eternal, timeless, outside of time, never born.”; This is important in the sense that it's a "trick" you can use to alter your current experiences and learn about the degree of power you have in exerting your will. But be careful with it. Your desire to transcend time is also a very human trait. Trying to transcend age is as human as identifying with age. Ask yourself, "What does it mean to move through time? How do I know an experience happened in the past? What's the nature of memory and what reality do memories have?"
>
> I think those are a lot more useful. But try them out for yourself.]

The trick of "waking up to the moment" as if you've just been dumped here is good for this. Also, you need to remember that if you *are* a deity-like figure, you *may have made some decisions prior to appearance* that you are now unaware of.

Reply to “Death”

> Q: But what makes you think you aren't dead right now?

Because he's God, and God is eternal. Of course.

> Q: If everything in God is life, where does the idea of death come from?

Duality. We are so used to the dichotomy of object/space, existance/nonexistance. We cannot comprehend 'oneness' and 'eternity'. The idea of death comes from the temporary nature of appearances.

> Q: Where does duality come from?

Good question. The sense of *here* and *there*, from the identity we accumulate gradually from birth and from language, from the tendency of our 'attentional profile' to become 'clumpy' and jump to objects instead of spaces?

> Q: Duality is inherent to all cognition. Even non-duality is known only in contradistinction to duality.

Ah, nice. All words imply a surrounding space, implying an "other". Language guarantees seeing the world in terms of dualities.

> [Nefandi: Language / Beyond language.
>
> Duality / Non-duality.
>
> Conceptual / Non-conceptual. <-- this distinction is a concept, btw.
>
> That which is beyond duality is also beyond ordinary cognition.]

A-ha, I like that. So, maybe also: *direct experience* vs *thinking-about* or *conceptualising*.

> Q: Well, "direct experience" suggests that there is indirect experience. But experience is always direct. Self-limited people have direct experience, not indirect.

The contrast is between, say, actually *feeling* the space in the room or *experiencing* being vastness, rather than thinking-about it. When you talk to people about this stuff, sometimes it's hard to get them to actually use their awareness, rather than just play with the concepts. Took me a while on that score.

Of course, thinking is still a direct experience - of thinking!

> Q: Much better than possibly implying people have indirect experiences.

Yes, all experience is direct, it's a case of: what is the *nature* of that experience. To realise what's going on, it's a matter of directing your attention to the right place. Experience is experience is experience. There can be no indirect, when experience is *made from you*.

> Q: And this amazing "thing" that people could be feeling, this undefined timeless place which is the site of experiencing, it isn't far away! It's closer than the veins in one's own neck. It's all right here.

Right! *Intimate* is the word!

> Q: Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet - Tennyson

People spend years meditating and following this or that path. All of that can be fun, but it is not necessary. You can simply *direct your attention to where you are looking from*, and see that it is capacity for everything.

In a way, there's nothing more to say than that, once you've got it.

Playfulness, yes. Insanity one I'm interested in. Also, art and magick and awareness are inexplicably bound, exploring the creative process, combining the two, all that.

> Q: Our minds are infinitely creative. You don't have to work yourself over to become creative.

This is bang-on true. In fact, people applying *effort* to creativity is what prevents it. People try to keep busy doing stuff thinking this will make them more productive and produce more ideas. But that's not true. What you have to do is, *clear space for the ideas to come*. Or should I say, *allow* space. Creativity is the rule!

Reply to “Playfulness.”

Extra one: Imagine - *feel* - that beyond your field of view, the world just stops, and there's just... blankness. If you're indoors, the view out of the window is just a flat picture, nothing behind it. If you're outside, then the landscape at the end of the road or the garden is just a vertical image, then nothing. And as you walk around and the landscape unfolds, really imagine that it's being created 'just-in-time' for you to experience.

(Extended version: There's *always* darkness in the direction you're not looking in, in your own self portrait, and the things you see before you are just floating transparencies.)



[...]

Schizophrenia here we come for the first bit! :-) I really like the "live mash-up" idea, turning things into blended movie scenes. Great!

> Q: But honestly, a shift towards some healthier perspectives and philosophies makes mental issues it a totally different experience.

Hmm, so if people have a larger context then these experiences aren't necessarily so problematic. The universe *does* give you messages, but not *always*; you are connected to something larger than yourself, but you are *also* an individual. It's when we are consumed by the experiences that it's a problem.

> Q: ... how they took a shaman from Africa and showed him the ... He says we have lost the power of ritual which brings understanding and peace to those persons.

With psychotherapy and so on being modern attempts to vent that, but only within a specific modern context. Interestingly though, more and more techniques are approaching vision-searching and shamanic types - Focusing and Reichian stuff, even the current mindfulness fashion. The more we lock ourselves down and 'externalise' aspects of ourselves, they more they will try to break through?

> Q: The truth is that normality is a variable in space and time. And delusions stem from interpreting strangeness as symptoms, instead of tools to dismantle the conventional boundary between reality and fiction, truth and falsehood, sense and nonsense.

Yes, I think a lot of modern problems arise from trying to deliberately narrow our experience within certain boundaries - our experience of what's around us *and* what arises within us. This is why modern life can be so stressful maybe: you are subtly engaged in a constant fight with your moment-to-moment experience.

> Q: The missing skill for the typical modern western person, I believe, is to be able to actively engage and disengage with experiences, both conventional and bizarre.

I suppose our basic model is that of "we see things directly". This isn't even about materialism/idealism or whatever - just the assumption that our experiences are unmediated, and responding to them in that way. So we tend to discount things even as simple as how our attention is directed, and that we can take control/responsibility for that, than we can widen with context, or narrow for immersion.

Instead, it just all seems to "happen to us", mostly. That, and not understanding intention; trying to do everything 'muscularly' or 'bodily', not realising that the direction we "set" is the main creator - I have been thinking.

Any moves in society which shift us along these lines has to be a good thing.

> Q: It seems more and more in recent years, to me, that the right way is to not append a truth value to it.

To accept the experience as is, and then have the interpretation as an additional thing, rather than having the two be blended? Then the interpretation can be judged on its usefulness. I like that.

Although this subreddit is about subjective idealism, my baseline default view I go for is much simpler and is simply that of direct experience. Upon investigation:

- It feels like there is a big open space of awareness.
- A world of objects seems to arise within that.
- Bodily sensations and thoughts appear there too.
- The experience seems to respond to my intention in limited ways.
- The response seems to include the environment, as well as my thoughts and my bodily actions: coincidences and opportunities, tuned.
- Whatever is "behind" the experience can never be known, or whether there *is* anything.

With the addition then that anything else is "explanatory icing on top" and should be recognised as such. Getting narrowed on any one interpretation tend to block out the arising of, or the recognition of, other paths that might come up which are better suited to your desires as they change.

("Getting narrowed" was the nature of *my* mistake which got me into *my* messes.)

[...]

Nice. One word: *soundtracking!* Similarly, if you're bored, adding (non-matching, comedy) subtitles onto your day is good fun. Don't pre-think them, just decide you're going to have some appear when people are talking, and you'll be surprised at what comes up. Oh, and everyone should be wearing a silly hat.

That's great, how it can be customised too; I'm going to play with using that sound.

I wonder how far we can go with this, treating our current experience as the "raw material" and editing it. This is pushing towards hypnotism all this (of course, same thing really), but can we edit *out* sounds and so on, on the fly? I can add things *in*, pictures and extra sounds, with varying levels of clarity, but I'm not so good at *deleting*. And then, how persistent can things get.

> Q: My only beef with hypnosis is that most of it is highly associated with profit-seeking, and also...

Often, but that's more in the use than in the phenomenon itself. Actually one of the first 'esoteric' books I read was on hypnosis, by this guy whose page on fallacies is quite interesting. That and some book on visualisation by Ursula Markham, who first introduced me to the idea that visualising could affect reality (the old "create a car parking space for yourself" trick in particular).

> Q: We can, at least in principle. Isn't this known as a negative hallucination in hypnosis?

Yes, that's why I brought up hypnosis - but I don't seem to be able to do it by my own self-suggestion. And yet, I was viewing this editing process we're doing as essentially self-hypnosis. But actually, there's a bit of a difference between doing direct imagination stuff and *suggesting* something and accepting/allowing it.

> Q: I agree completely. But in practice, suppose you want to learn about hypnosis? . . .

This is where old-fashioned books come into their own. That the internet is the place we look for all our information means we are constrained by the 'form' that it shapes things into (websites, forums all require monetisation or that's why they were started). Authors of paperback books on a topic used to do it for the passion and for a selected audience, because the money wasn't good and the availability would be limited anyway. There are few website versions of that sort of thing, except from more academic researchers or a passion for spreading the good news.

>Q: Let's see... how about editing out pain? Am I dissolving pain or editing it out? How would I know the difference?

Good point. Pain is an interesting one. You can dissolve it just by including into the the awareness space that surrounds it. This also works for distracting sounds: it seems to be the attempt to isolate the sound or ignore it which makes it distracting. But that's not quite deletion, it's incorporation or dissolving object boundaries into the continuum.

> Q: What is the difference you think?

I'm really not sure. At root, it must be the same thing. Something like the difference between deliberately picturing a car (which means you create a particular, chosen image), say, and just saying the word "car" to yourself (which will result in a picture appearing spontaneously). Is it about the level of detail you attempt to control? "Control" seems to be at the core though.

> Q: You know that some languages are pictorial to begin with. Like the ancient Chinese was just a bunch of pictures. What I mean is, pictures are not necessarily all that different from words.

But there *is* a difference between generic symbol and particular instance. Chinese might be a "bunch of pictures", but it's not a bunch of specific images. In the first case I'm choosing *this* car (controlling the details), in the second I'm requesting *a* car. So with deletion, perhaps dying to control the negative directly is the problem (basically "don't think of an elephant"?). I dunno.

> Q: As I've learned hypnosis is 99% hard work though. I thought there was some trick to it, but nope. Just practice, practice, practice....

I think what's being practiced, though, is *intention* and *being passive*, no? The trick to self-hypnosis was always acceptance/giving up, or that's what I found. It's both easy and very difficult (like the threshold thing when inducing an OBE). The thing I found hardest was to resist the urge to try and *make* it happen.

> Q: I agree. Words and symbols are more abstract. A symbol doesn't tell you about shadows, hues, and the details of the shapes.

Suggestion: Symbols are abstract, but experiences are always concrete? (Except the experience of a symbol.) So I see the word "car", but it works by triggering a bit of a "car experience" in my awareness; that's how I get the 'meaning" of the word.

By abstraction I mean "does not resemble the thing it represents, is pointing to". By concrete experience I mean, an experience based on senses, even if "mental senses". So the sense of myself might not be solid like a table, but it's still a direct experience, even though I can't describe it properly. "George", however, is an abstract symbol *pointing to* that experience.

Actually, I should reassign my words. Let's have *symbols* are pointers (obviously), *abstractions* are non-direct-sensory experiences (although they will likely be made up of images, sensations, etc), *concrete* experiences are external-world-type.

Because when I think of the past, although I experience it as a visual timeline from left to right in my experience, obviously it's an abstraction. And if I *feel* time passing, sure it's a feeling, but it's not a *thing*.

> Q: "I" in this case doesn't point to anything.

Well, that's a special one of course!

> Q: Maybe the distinction between concrete and abstract is purely conventional and arbitrary.

I think that's so. All experiences are "concrete" in some way (there's always a sensory component), but they may *mean* something else. When an experience just *means itself* then that's fundamental.

That's why you can't explain love, it is "just itself".

Having said that, I think the experiences you list correspond to a "landscape of feelings", bodily sensations, that correspond to the subject or idea or the experience of "being in love" or whatever. You think with your whole body. If you think of "a tree" you get a picture maybe, and some sounds, maybe the idea of an environment, but also *your whole body subtly changes into a slight tension-pattern associated with that idea*.

This *feeling-aspect* is key to experience and *knowing/being*, but cannot be properly verbalised.

What are feelings, if not bodily sensations? If you are scared, for instance, how does that manifest itself?

Impatience is, I'd suggest, a feeling of *tension* between the position you are in now (literally, physically) and the position you'd like to be in - a muscular tension pattern.

You hear sounds without physical ears, your see pictures without eyes, you feel touch without hands, you feel bodily sensations without a body. You don't actually ever experience a 'physical' body anyway, of course. Even if you were a materialist, you would still have to say that you experience your body "after the fact", as a mental object. We could say "body-space-located" perhaps. But anyway, the feeling of fear is, say, a tight feeling in the stomach area, a clenching of the chest, other sensations, etc.

Open awareness at base (how can one experience a lack of something?).

"Tension" is there's a discomfort associated with the perceived lack of change.

But what would the nature of that experience be? A *tension* between your expectation and what's there? For instance, there's a difference between just experiencing an empty garden, and experiencing an empty garden *while expecting it to be full of trees*. The basic experience is the same, but the latter has tension?

> Q: So "an apple" doesn't really refer to anything per se.

Platonic ideals! "An apple" conjurs up a "mental object" of an "apple" (in picture form, other sensations, probably a whole structure actually), that fits or becomes "attached" or anticipates a whole spectrum of experience. (This is an unsettled topic from hundreds of years, of course.)

I'm going to suggest it's a "global sense of apple" and that it's more *felt* than experienced as, say, a particular image. That's what I was getting at by "probably a whole structure".

There are only experiences? We've just got into the habit of *categorising* some experiences as "concrete" (tables) and some as "abstract" (not tables). More specifically, when we look deeper, we discover that we define things which are actually *felt-senses* and *felt-knowing* as abstract. Probably just because they can't be described in verbal language, and representations can't be created in terms of images or sounds or sculptures. However, these *felt-senses* can to some extent be *evoked* by other experiences. And that is what art is.

> Q: I know what you mean. But I tell you, when I was floating in blackness in that one experience, I felt fear and I couldn't feel anything like a stomach or tightness, at least, not anything normal that would be obvious.

I do know the experience (a version of it). It still seems to me that it is a "located feeling" with a "meaning". Hmm, but it's basically going to be a *felt-sense* meaning. You don't need an actual spatial body to have that experience, I guess.

[...]

The pure-blackness experience is one of the things that eyesight improvement tries to do - the Bates Method, specifically. You imagine pure blackness behind your eyes, which corresponds to complete relaxation of the eyeball, hence optimal vision. Supposedly. But it shows the overlap between imagination and perception.

> Q: I guess we feel like it's editing if we think phenomenon exists objectively in some external domain. Otherwise we feel it's more like dissolving. But I don't know if there is a clear difference.

That's an interesting point. Also, there's a warning after dissolving pain not to "go looking for it" afterwards to check it's gone or whatever, because you end up re-creating it.

Hmmm.... Dissolving is "delocalising" I suppose, de-objectifying something. That's how the pain thing works: you are dissolving the boundaries around a "stuck thought". Dissolving/editing a tree, what does that mean in this context? Exclusion of it from your awareness field I guess, releasing it into the background. "Inserting a new fact" into experience. What we experience is a continuum which is "cut up" into objects, so we're not deleting that part of raw experience, we're just saying "don't interpret that as a tree", maybe?

> Q: In fact I like to check it out often, just to see if it dares to resurface. If the pain does resurface, that's good. I just remove it again, and better.

For sure. I think the advice is tailored to those less well-versed than the likes of you and I! But it's an interesting point: that you can dissolve and and recreate it at will. So it's not *real-real*.

> Q: "What we experience is a continuum which is "cut up" into objects, so we're not deleting that part of raw experience, we're just saying "don't interpret that as a tree", maybe?" Maybe. I've never done this, keep in mind. So I can't talk from experience.

I was thinking of how it might work in hypnosis. Thing is, I'll secretly know it's a tree; do I have to avoid "going looking for it"? I like your idea of starting by making things fuzzy. I'll play with this next time I'm bored in the garden.

[...]

> [AesirAnatman: I play with some things, nothing extraordinary. Sometimes, I imagine the people around me as only skeletons, stomachs, and shit. That is, I imagine that they don't have anything else as a body besides bones, stomach acid, and food waste (waiting to be deposited in a 'toilet'). When I do this (and similar practices) a lot I am pulled out of the conventional 'attractive'/'unattractive' mindset and ignore the way people look more, sometimes to the point of not noticing 'dramatic' haircut/hairstyle changes of coworkers and similar things.
>
> I spend a lot of time when I'm walking to and from school imagining walking around and feeling and seeing everything around me. Along with this I imagine using my mind to throw objects around and into each other to become familiar with how the objects interact in my imagination - I've done this so much that sometimes I have a feeling of all the objects around me and how they relate to each other and my body without much thinking. I have a much more direct feeling of the object (or my belief in the object) than just ordinary sensations.
>
> I've also played with size. I imagine that my body as it is is the way a body that's 3 inches tall feels and imagine looking around the same room from that perspective. I also do this in reverse to feel massive, while still feeling the same size.
>
> One time I imagined that corporations had an independent being (like spirits/demons) and were possessing the employees and buildings. This was a really dramatic perspective shift that was

> temporary - people seemed like ants when they were at jobs - totally without autonomy. At the same time I imagined that houses were similarly possessed by spirits and were possessing the people and artifacts within them. I imagined that people moving in/out of a home was that home changing its personality. The void that I started to see in people's eyes began to creep me out, as did the weird feeling this created when I would walk down a street.
>
> I've played with imagining that there is no world at all beyond my senses, as some one else mentioned. In the past I've played with externalizing my thoughts into sounds while I was falling asleep and ended up hearing different external voices that were my thoughts. The voices changed depending on the mood of my thought. They started to develop some autonomy, so I then dissolved them. I've not done this since. I've played with imagining that I'm already dead and in the afterlife. I recently imagined that every relationship between objects was mediated by an attractive fairy. Then I replaced those with Santa Claus's. Then I replaced them with versions of me. There's probably other stuff, but that's what came to mind.]

"One time I imagined that corporations had an independent being (like spirits/demons) and were possessing the employees and buildings . . ."; That's good. The corporation as egregore/servitor. Probably truth in that. Interesting to actually get yourself to *see* things that way, though.

"The void that I started to see in people's eyes began to creep me out, as did the weird feeling this created when I would walk down a street."; Shows how you "fill in" the idea that there are "actual people" inside the bodies you pass by every day. But really, you don't know. (Philosophical zombies!)

> [In philosophy of mind, a **philosophical zombie** (or "**p-zombie**") is a being in a thought experiment that is physically identical to a normal human being but does not have conscious experience. For example, if a philosophical zombie were poked with a sharp object, it would not feel any pain, but it would react exactly the way any conscious human would. In other words, the being has full access consciousness but no phenomenal consciousness. Philosophical zombie arguments are used against forms of physicalism and in defense of the hard problem of consciousness, which is the problem of accounting in physical terms for subjective, intrinsic, first-person, what-it's-like-ness experiences. Proponents of philosophical zombie arguments, such as the philosopher David Chalmers, argue that since a philosophical zombie is by definition physically identical to a conscious person, even its logical possibility refutes physicalism. This is because it establishes the existence of conscious experience as a further fact.
>
> Zombie arguments often support lines of reasoning that aim to show that zombies are metaphysically possible in order to support some form of dualism—in this case the view that the world includes two kinds of substance (or perhaps two kinds of property): the mental and the physical. In physicalism, material facts determine all other facts. Since any fact other than that of consciousness may be held to be the same for a p-zombie and for a normal conscious human, it follows that physicalism must hold that p-zombies are either not possible or are the same as normal humans.
>
> - Wikipedia, "Philosophical Zombie"]

It seems that maybe when you "externalise" anything (basically, declaring it not under your direct control now) it takes on a bit of an independent will of its own. Basically like little servitors or spirits, but it could go quite wrong quite quickly if you're not grounded in yourself. ("Schizophrenia here we come!" again.)

This post - on the sigil/servitor Fotamecus for time compression - is what brought that thought to mind. Once something is out there, it can become its own thing. I'm not quite sure how to integrate that stuff into the 'subjective reality' worldview as yet.

> **[“Don't Blame Me, Blame My Servitor”, by Fenwick Rysen. 26 July 1998 (Published in "Kaos Magick Journal" Summer, 1999)**
>
> I'm not sure whether I should be worried or not. You see, Chronos is a nice enough God of Time, but he is a bit old and I'm not sure he stands a chance against what's about to hit him. Of course, he has enslaved all of Western society to the clock, so maybe he deserves it, but still yet I feel kind of sorry for him.
>
> You see, it all started when I began playing with the idea of time magick. Not that I'm responsible for what's coming, mind you--- I'll pass the blame off to Fotamecus before anyone blames me. I turned him loose a long time ago, and I take no responsibility for his actions, especially with him ranting "Chronos, your time has come" every time I see him. Perhaps I should explain.
>
> My own involvement with time magick was actually quite accidental. One day I got to thinking about time and how it flows, and how each hour is supposed to be the same length as all the others. Yet this didn't make sense to me--- sometimes an hour flies by as if minutes, and other times it drags on for ages. The end result of the thinking ran something like this: If we can use magick in any area of our lives, and if Time is a mutable substance, why can't we use magick to mess around with time? And thinking usually gets me into trouble sooner or later.
>
> So one afternoon, running behind schedule, the thought passed through my mind to use magick to speed the journey. Listening to the radio as I drove down the freeway, I created a suitable Statement of Intent: "Force Time Into Compression." Because driving doesn't lend itself well to artistic sigilization, I instead reduced it to a four-syllable mantra that I could chant to radio music: "Fotamecus". Despite little preparation, it worked exceptionally well, and I thought that this would be the end of it.
>
> The next day a good friend of mine, Quinn the Mad Prophet (don't ask), approached me and asked about sigilization techniques a la Austin Spare. Requiring a demonstration sigil, I chose to use "Fotamecus", explaining the previous day's success with it. From the mantra, I created an artistic sigil that Quinn put in his wallet for future reference, inadvertantly placing himself under its influence. Many stories of truly rapid transit followed, culminating in a Metallica concert where Quinn's goal was to "suck up all that free gnosis."
>
> All of that free gnosis that Quinn sucked up was dumped into the Fotamecus sigil to speed the trip home, and a two hour journey took only thirty minutes. Even more surprising, the energy was enough to push the sigil over the border to servitorhood. I've used this technique before, of feeding a sigil enough gnosis until it created an independent servitor, but neither the Mad Prophet nor I had ever done it by accident. So without a home and with nowhere to go, the Fotamecus servitor, young and unintelligent, started following us around. Whenever we needed to compress or expand time we

would feed it a bit of gnosis and it would do the job. It started "growing up" as we fed it, growing a little more intelligent and a bit stronger each time we used it. We thought this good and well, for the stronger he got the better he did his job.

Over Thanksgiving weekend in 1996, I crammed with six other chaotes into a van headed for Death Valley. Calling on Fotamecus while in the San Francisco Bay Area, we travelled fifty miles in fifteen minutes through both heavy traffic and the MacArthur Maze, the most dizzying interchange of highways known to man. Immediately after Fotamecus began to work, we lost a car of friends that had been following us.

Even though we killed 45 minutes at a rest stop afterwards, when we re-entered the freeway we met right up with the other car even though they had never stopped. We thought the magick had worked very well until we received the backlash later that day.

For time compressed, an equal amount of time was expanded. The balance was kept. Travelling at sixty miles an hour, a fifteen mile stretch of desert highway took nearly an hour to cross. If we had already reached our destination, the expansion would have been fine, but Fotamecus was only able to hold off the backlash from the initial compression for so long.

After several similar events we mulled over various ideas to correct the problem of backlash and hit upon the idea of viral servitors--- the key to a process of mutation that would allow Fotamecus to eventually grow beyond our control. We worked several rituals in which we altered the sigil to make it possible for Fotamecus to make copies of itself. These copies wired themselves into a network that made them incredibly effective at preventing unwanted side effects. If one of them needed to compress time and another to expand it they would pass it off to each other through the viral network, maintaining balance and reducing the possibility of backlash.

Our only problem was that we didn't limit how large the network could grow. There was no check against it--- nothing to keep it from getting out of our control. And the only problem with a reproducing virus is that sooner or later it mutates.

It was about this time that news of Fotamecus started spreading through the Internet, and an online graphic of the sigil was printed out by many for personal use. Hundreds of copies were spawned and the power of the Fotamecus Viral Servitor Network continued to grow.

As the network grew, so did the power of Fotamecus. The whole thing started acting less and less like a legion of indpendent servitors and more and more like an individual entity. He started showing greater signs of intelligence--- he would hold interesting conversations, show up when needed without request, and applied greater precision in his use of time manipulation to get the most mileage from the least effort. It became obvious to the Mad Prophet and I that he was slipping out of our control and was about to become something else. The mutation had begun, and there was little we could do to stop it.

Only a year after his initial creation, he ceased to be a network of pieces and became more than the sum of his parts. His parts were still identifiable, but they were becoming less and less distinct. The viral network itself was now stronger than the individual servitors, and looked more like a spirit in its own right with each passing day.

The full mutation took place during the hour long Midnight to Midnight when Pacific Daylight Time became Pacific Standard Time in October of 1997. Using mundane time expansion of an hour that didn't technically exist, we performed a ritual in his name that was designed to charge him with power for whatever use he saw fit. Seven people and one smashed clock were the only witnesses to the ritual.

For three days he just disappeared. Petitions for help went unanswered, conversations were one-way talks to nothingness. Divination confirmed that yes, he was still alive, but that no, he wasn't responding to anything. So we waited, and three days later he rose from the dead more changed than we had ever expected.

Many chaos magicians speak of spirits as spanning a continuum of power from the tiniest unintelligent servitor, to egregores of moderate power, to godforms capable of controlling entire cultures. In one popular theory, all godforms were at some time on the short end of the stick, and through constant use they amassed power and rose from servitor to egregore to full status as a godform. When asked how long this takes, many chaotes shrug and guess that each step takes decades or even centuries. I would say that this grossly underestimates the potential for their growth, for when we next saw Fotamecus he was no longer a puny little servitor but an egregore powerful enough to shrug us off and make his own demands.

I still don't know what allowed him to cross that boundary. I suspect that when you give a servitor enough energy from enough different people it will become an egregore, much as a sigil can become a servitor after being the recipient of strong gnosis. But similar egregores I had dealt with in the past had not been nearly as strong as Fotamecus had become, though it shouldn't have been too much of a surprise. By this time, there were hundreds of people using him daily around the world, each of them feeding him a little more power with each use. Along with the ritual performed during the Daylight Savings time-change, it was enough to push him over that border with change to spare. He reintegrated the individual parts as his limbs, while the network became his mind. Granted, he wasn't a very strong egregore yet, but he had plans of his own at this point, and he would have been difficult for any one individual to control.

Lucky for us he was friendly and wasn't about to take revenge for any perceived abuse suffered as a servitor. Instead he showed up, let us know of his egregore-hood and what was going on, and then faded into the background from where he would manipulate events. One could petition him in the same manner as before, but his skill at time manipulation had reached mastery. Oftentimes he showed up unrequested, giving help before we could think to ask for it. There were even times when he was strong enough to get us to our destinations before we had left for them. Certainly not the work of a puny servitor!

I don't see much of him anymore, but he does show up when I need him. He usually has a better idea of when I need him than I do. And sometimes he just drops by for a chat. At 2 a.m. sitting in a Denny's just a few weeks after attaining his egregore-hood, I had a particularly revealing conversation with him. It seems that he's not satisfied with being an egregore--- he wants to head for godhood and the only thing standing in his way is Chronos.

Chronos, god of fixed time--- his talismans are the timepieces that control our daily existence, his clocks are the prison guards to which we have become slaves. And never do we question his authority. But what could some upstart servitor with delusions of grandeur hope to offer?

In my own case, my full-time job became much more pleasant when I began to compress the entire day with his help. An eight-hour day felt like four or five, and this compression was fed back as expansion of my free time. A two hour lounge around the house often felt like three or four. If I needed more sleep, I would ask him to expand the night-time hours, and I would awake after five hours as if I had slept in late. So much for those last nagging doubts in my head that time is fixed and immutable. In this way does Fotamecus battle Chronos. We may be slaves to our clocks, but there is nothing to stop us from changing the flow of hours within those clocks.

Word has spread. More and more people are using Fotamecus every day, and with each new user he grows in power. Already he is plotting his attacks against Chronos with what seems to be a passionate hatred centered on vengeance for some unknown slight. He keeps muttering something about the millenium, and has told me on more than one occassion to keep an eye on London's Millenium Dome, which will hold more than 100,000 party-goers on December 31, 1999. Such comments are usually accompanied with the astral equivelant of a mischievous smile.

At this point I have a better relationship with him than I do with most gods I work with. And he seems to like me. Occasionally he pops up to tell me things to do for him, to get him out to more people or to give him ammunition for his war against Chronos. In return for a little publicity here and there, he helps me stretch those hours around the clock to get the most out of them. He even pokes me and prods me to write essays about him so that others will use him. By using his name as a mantra or by creating a ritual using his sigil to call him, he grows stronger day by day as new users feed him in return for his help. So sure, it may be neat to tell a story about how a servitor that Quinn and I accidentally created eventually ascended to egregorehood, but these days I feel more and more like I'm a servitor to Fotamecus that he feeds candy for being a good little magician. An odd relationship at best.

Fotamecus has been out of my control for a very long time now. I do worry a little bit about his war with Chronos--- I have absolutely no clue what he's got planned, and he's certainly not telling me. But to be perfectly honest, even if I am a bit worried, I've been enjoying the show. And with the millenium just around the corner it looks like it's only going to get better. This is what the Immanentization of the Eschaton is all about.]

> Q: Reversing heavy othering requires understanding othering, and having the heart to reverse it.

Servitors can be recalled and reabsorbed, but once you've created something that's expanded almost into a *world*, then it's a more daunting task, of course. Maybe more of a *reset*.

Reply to “Minimalism and Renunciation.”

What, no yachts then? ;-)

- Experiences

I can relate to much of this, and have experimented a little at both ends (being rich and being less so, being status-heavy and not). I've also experimented with letting "TriumphantGeorge" be moved by the background flow of consciousness, and at other times taking direct control of "TriumphantGeorge".

For me, life is about *experiences*. It can be fun to *experience having a Ferrari in the garage*, for instance, so long as you don't think you own an "object". What you "have" isn't made of "matter", it is made of "eyes and fingers". In other words, what you have is *access to a certain experience without latency.*

- Destruction and Emergence

It's relatively easy to switch to an impersonal experience: Just change the context of your attention to be the open, dark, silent, present, thought-free background upon which the patterns of experience arise. As you say, though, I think it can take some time for the structures that have accumulated - become *enfolded* into your conscious space - to dissolve. You can do this with an "overwriting" exercise, to bring your daily experience closer to transparency. This aim surely isn't necessarily to *remove those experiences*, but rather to *no longer be bound to them*. When I read of some people's efforts in this direction, I've sometimes thought that maybe: *It is perhaps a mistake to confuse destroying your current experience, with becoming non-attached to it. The former doesn't lead to the latter, necessarily, and is not even required for the latter.* In other words: Just by lying down each day and releasing our hold, the apparent world will naturally realign to our true nature. No grand physical acts of renunciation required. I still think there's nothing wrong with yachts, so long as you understand what they are. :-)

- Maximum Power!

If you really want full power, right now - basically, a reset - then suicide while persisting attention on the background is probably the way to go. Followed by something like the "sparkles" method for OBEs. Since you get that experience in the end anyway though, I never saw the hurry.

If you do the man-in-a-van thing, or the wandering nomad, what do you think is going to be cooler about it? Not a challenge, just interested. I find it totally fascinating. I'm not sure that you have to zero-out your current 'dream contents' to have everything you want though, but maybe it can make it come quicker?

> > Q: Of course having a Ferrari can be fun. But there are two things that come with having a Ferrari.

I agree with where you're coming from in general. That's why I say that usually we are seeking *experiences* rather than *status*. Because *status experiences*, such as "ownership", are conceptual, and often come with additional experiences that aren't desirable.

Ferraris: My answer generally is that you wouldn't want to *experience ownership* at all, unless you had so much money that it didn't matter. Rather, the experience you want is *using a Ferrari when you want it (and not having one when you don't)*, so surely you'd just "wish" for some sort of arrangement that gives you just that.

Aside: I used to live in an apartment block where a few people had expensive, high performance cars in the basement garage. They'd take them out for a spin periodically. Thing is, those cars aren't designed that way; they need to be constantly run and tuned, and kept in decent environments. Almost every time those guys took them out, they'd have to get the car jumped into motion, or it would have some sort of problem while they were taking their girlfriend on a trip to show off to her parents, or it'd have to be off for retuning before the trip. To be a member of a car club would make much more sense for these people - ah, but then they wouldn't have the "status" of "ownership".

This maybe fits more with what you're saying. But... why not use magick to have Ferraris and yachts and a cool house *and them not to have onerous obligations?* Why not use magick to have an income stream that *doesn't have burdens attached?* Perhaps... you are not being ambitious enough? ;-)

> Q: That's the thing. I see problems and conflicts between my present lifestyle and my future ambitions...

Basically, to be free of the influence of external powers (and internal powers).

> Q: I can visit... hermits (if they want to chat for a bit)

Can I just say, separately, that this is a *fantastic* line! :-)

Anyway, you've answered my next question which is: you seem to be focused on *freedom-from* rather than *freedom-to*. In my experience, the former takes care of itself, if you concentrate on the latter. (Magick works best by somewhat ignoring your present circumstances, and concentrating on the circumstances you desire?)

You have a student loan. Are you using magick to 'delete' that yet? Or are you going to slog through the three years?

> Q (AesirAnatman): That vs. sleeping in the same room in the same house with the same neighbors for several years, staring at screens, working for some jackass boss for the bulk of my life, having to deal with conventional humans's ignorant bullshit all the time, etc.

Thing is, in my viewpoint, you don't need to *physically* do anything about "human's ignorant bullshit"; it only impinges on your life to the extent you focus upon it. Like a dream where you fixate on something, then re-focus and it dissolves into the background. It was never really "there" anyway. You were just experiencing your own conceptual momentum rendered into apparent objects.

Personally, I'd least go for a Matthew McConaughey-style Airstream existence. :-)

> “All your life, all your love, all your hate, all your memory, all your pain. It was all the same thing. It was all the same dream that you had inside a locked room. That dream about being a person. And like a lot of dreams , there is a monster at the end of it.”
>
> — Rust Cohle [Matthew McConaughey], *True Detective* (HBO)

So much of this perhaps results from your current ongoing attachment to the material world, while your ambition is to be unattached to this, as a way of realising your potential as God. However, becoming God will

be a case of *recognition*, not *becoming*. If you are not God now, you can't become God. So your path is about reaching this conclusion and accepting it, surely.

All the rest - Ferraris, money, desires - doesn't really matter much, just images in consciousness. They're here because, as God, you have implicitly created them. And your sense of limitation, the same. I think you might just be putting off the inevitable. How are you going to transition?

I repeat: If you are ever going to be God, then it must already be so, simply concealed from you, by You. You must in fact already be the whole world, and not just /u/AesirAnatman. There are no other people, and no /u/AesirAnatman, except as fragments of You.

As has been said elsewhere, the truth is that you are a *vast space of consciousness, in which all experience - this world - arises*. The content of this space is a direct result of your *intention*. All content - thought, body sensation and movement, surrounding landscape - is a response to the momentum of your intentions.For as long as you act based upon the assumptions and concepts of a material world of limitation, your results will occur bound to those assumptions and concepts. But really, **you are already free.** When you do get around to destroying the world, building a different one, how will it differ? (Given that your current world is like it is, because you are like you are: it is a reflection of you.)

> Q: What I want is to become conscious of my manifestation of the apparently external world and reclaim control over it in the same way that I am conscious of and control my manifestation of my body and thoughts.

Got ya. The thing is, as you point out later, you don't usually directly control even your body and thoughts; there is already the momentum of previous intentions. Rather you 'amend the direction' that things are going in. The larger world within you has the same problem: habits have been established, have momentum/inertia, so these days very few manifestations seem 'direct'.

> Q: I agree with you. But I am not conscious of my intentions. I don’t pay attention to them and am deeply habituated along certain mental pathways.

Yeah. It's a major difficulty, actually. You usually can't be aware of your intentions, because they are *first-cause*, you can only infer them. Even if you intend deliberately, what's actually happening is that you're experiencing a result, the "deliberately"; the intention already occurred. That's why people tend to work on their assumptions and beliefs, on deleting the 'structure' they have accumulated. "Eliminating habituation", you said nicely. Or hold on to a "feeling" that corresponds to their desire, so that experience falls in line.

> Q: Magick would be a much more common power – similar to the Force, except more powerful and somewhat more common. That’s some of what I would do if I were able to consciously reconstruct reality, at least at first.

I think magick must have been more common in "the past". Our shift over the last few hundred years has been dramatic. Once people imagine the world to be a certain, other way, it tends to behave accordingly, annoyingly. "Release all your desires from the internal, so that they are forced to manifest in the external", is an approach I've been playing with.

> Q: The problem of commitments and habits is a secondary problem. The primary problem is ignorance.

I see those as the same hurdle to overcome? You are right that we "ignore... the vast majority of our being". We attend to the surface appearances, "the show", and forget the script, the internal from which the world is "pushed out" into the external.

On intentions: I think you *infer* your intentions from the thoughts and events that occur to you. But then, having realised where things are going, you can redirect?

> Q: That's why people tend to work on their assumptions and beliefs, on deleting the 'structure' they have accumulated. "Eliminating habituation", you said nicely. Or hold on to a "feeling" that corresponds to their desire, so that experience falls in line. *Can you explain more?*

Coincidentally, I was just having a conversation earlier. Experiences leave traces which influence other experiences, and so on. Uninterrupted, your world (internal and external) deterministically unfolds in whichever direction its going, in alignment with your enfolded beliefs and expectations. *Unless you update those beliefs and expectations.*

How do we do this, how do we detect it? If your experience is a result of your 'enfolded structure', then you can't experience it directly. But, your "feeling of how things are", your "felt sense" does contain this. It's like a global summary of the structure of your world. To change the direction of your experience, you must *change the underlying structure*, which you do by asserting new facts, and having them *felt to be true*. Subsequent content will then fall in line. (The content of your experience is transparent and illusory, what you do with that simply doesn't matter.)

I still struggle with wording this "intention" stuff well. So, please indulge my attempt and bounce back so I can clarify, get my thinking better on it!

> Q: Maybe some intentions are inferred. But I think many are directly recognized. For example, if I start paying attention I notice that my body is sitting right now - thus, it is my intention to manifest my body as sitting. My body is typing at the computer in response to your comment - thus, it is my intention to manifest a response to your comment.

I'm not so sure about this. I think that there is a "momentum" to events, to thoughts and actions and the environment, that continues deterministically until we use our "free will" to interfere are redirect it. At which point it becomes a deterministic chain pointing in a new direction.

> Q: Further, it was my unconscious intention to be bouncing my leg, but when I noticed/realized what I was doing, I was able to decide/intend to keep my leg still.

I'd have that as an example of interfering, but perhaps not even. This just happened automatically as a set of experiences one after the other. Your attention spontaneously moved to your bouncing leg, which then stopped, and your attention moved again... and so on.

> Q: Would you provide an example of how intentions could be inferred?

In the same way as character. Your idea of who someone is, is a bundle of experiences of that person, from which you infer what that person "is like".

Intention - as "first cause" - is a movement or reshaping of consciousness of itself, by itself. Like a blanket folding itself, or a pool of water rippling itself. You cannot find the "cause" of the fold or the ripple, only the

"results": the folds and the ripple. You *infer* that the folds or ripples were "intended", but you cannot find the "action" that led to the "result", because they are the same. One the "first cause" has happened, the ripples continue in a deterministic fashion, the pattern propagates automatically, until another ripple is created by "first cause", and so on.

In this case, we don't "intend" everything we appear to do - all those appearance are *result*, patterns in consciousness. Those results could be called our "intention" (as in, what we meant to happen), but the *intending itself* is occasional, and cannot be experienced.

Some people *never intend*. They are born, and they just play our in alignment with their initial nature or direction. Others constantly interfere, suppressing the spontaneous movements and responses and become disconnected and separate, internal vs external. The happy balance is to occasionally decide what you want to happen, and intend it (by declaration/acceptance or a variation there of), and then let things be.

Note: If you have a thought "I will do this" or "this will happen" and then the action occurs, the thought didn't cause the action; the thought isn't the *intending*. It's just another result.

TL;DR: "Intending" is a particular thing, consciousness changing itself. It is not the same as an action.

> Q: Ok, I understand. Deciding to manifest new beliefs and thus altering reality according to our will. Magick.

Yep, basically. You can "insert a belief/fact" that a particular event will happen, or you can "insert a belief/fact" that is more general, that the world now 'works a certain way' from now on. I've come to think, though, that the best approach is first to *absolutely let go of all control, of all hold on yourself and the environment*. To accept everything just as it is, as an experience, with no backing or belief structure. From there, with a minimum of "enfolded forms", your assertions can take maximum effect, because they are no longer filtered in the same way.

Give it all up, to get it all.

Which a few texts make reference to actually: let everything go, to gain everything; destroy yourself to gain the universe; the meek shall inherit the Earth.

> Q: I think that momentum isn't objectively out there. We believe that the mind has a sort of momentum, and so it manifests that way.

Yes, I agree with this. The problem is where we draw the line, for convenience, when describing this. Will try to pin it down a bit more later.

> Q: I think it is possible to manifest a reality with no habit, with no momentum. Instantaneously manifesting every new whim and impulse regardless of what was manifested previously.

I think this is indeed possible, and as we relieve ourselves of what I will call "enfolded structure" then more things can happen and by more direct narrative routes (or even no route at all).

> Q: Hmm. I don't think like this. I think everyone is always intending, but in different ways. Some people are mostly creatures of habit, living out the same basic lifestyles they have lived for many lifetimes.

So, this is where we need to clear things up. We probably don't differ, but we are using "intending" and "deciding" and "momentum" differently. I probably mean something more like "redirecting". Let me try and paint a picture and we'll see. I'll begin without using those words, and then try to reach definitions by the end. Please excuse length!

The Experiential Mind-Space: Implicate & Explicate, Enfolding & Unfolding

1. The Structure of Experience

I'm going to assert that the structure of personal experience is something like this diagram.


Enfolded Form
- Residual pattern built up from previous experiences, subject to direct intention
"Experiential Mind-Space"
Unfolded Object
- Experience snaps to and unfolds in alignment with enfolded forms, spontanously and automatically

Fig 1. An illustration of the relationship between enfolded forms (belief, expectation, memory traces) and unfolding experience. In an ongoing feedback process, experiences leave traces which then in-form the structure of subsequent experiences, as spatial and temporal structures - i.e. objects and narrative, respectively. To change the nature of experience requires exposure of the ground to alternative types of experience ("external" change) or a shifting of the form of the ground directly ("internal" or first-cause change).

We have an open 'mind-space' in which our experiences arise. Experiences leave traces, "structure" enfolded into the background, and that affects subsequent experiences, which tend to unfold by "snapping to" the pre-existing traces, and so on.

. . . unfolded experience (explicate) > enfolded traces (implicate) > unfolded experience (explicate) > . . .

So we have an "implicate" level (containing enfolded forms) and an "explicate" level (the unfolded objects you are experiencing at that moment). At this point in the description we are completely passive. Experiences are simply happening to us, and over time the memory-traces are funnelling subsequent experiences into a stable

form: call it "habits" or "regularities" or "laws" or whatever. Also, these correspond to "beliefs" and "expectations" and even "facts" - the same thing!

If the universe began with random noise, gradually it would evolve into a structured environment. The way dreams start, from hypnogogic sparkles and imagery, is like this. A while world is formed by itself without input. (By experiences, I mean both sensory and thought, they're the same, and both leave traces in the implicate order. They differ *only* intensity. I'll pick up on that later.)

2. Momentum and Intention

What I've called conceptual momentum is basically just the fact that, left alone, patterns of experience become more and more established and have greater influence. When I talk of "intention" what I mean is the decision to directly interrupt this process and redirect it. Of course, you might say that *not* interfering is itself an intention, but I want to be more specific about the term.

Intention is the act of deliberately changing the enfolded structure of the "implicate" level.

Having made these changes, the experiences that unfold at the "explicate" level will afterwards be aligned with the new "facts of the world'. We cannot affect the unfolded objects of the present moment directly - they are just mirages, completely transparent and without substance. All change must happen at the enfolded level.

The changes made to the implicate level might involve the insertion of a single event ("this will happen tomorrow") or a new state ("this is now true") or a new relationship ("thinking this means that this action will follow") or broader rule ("this always happens") or statement of identity ("I am like this"). However, in all cases we are simply changing the shape of the 'sand dunes' upon which the 'mirages' are formed.

3. The Mechanism of Change

The key to this is that there is only one mind-space. So just as spontaneous sensory experiences leave traces which affect future experience, so *thought leaves traces which affect future experience*. Thinking of a particular image will tend to result in experience following those images, etc. However, this is not very powerful. What you want to do is change the 'global' structure at the implicate level, not just create particular instances. This is done by the additional sense: our "feel" of the world, our "direct knowing".

By creating the feeling of something being true, we adjust our enfolded structures to correspond to that fact. All magick - visualisation, ritual, etc - is simply an indirect way of generating that 'feeling of truth'. However, it can be done *directly*. What "intention" really is, in fact, is the raw summoning of that "feeling of truth", of shifting your implicate structure directly into a new state that corresponds to the world you want to live in.

4. Overwriting Yourself with Empty Space

Finally, this leads to one of my favourite exercises. What we really want to do is open ourselves out from habitual paths of experience so that more things are possible, by the quickest route (or *no* route: instant manifestation). How to do, given the above?

Basically, we want to overwrite our enfolded structures, our implicate level, with open unstructured space - complete possibility. We do this by literally switching our focus to the background awareness, and *asserting as fact* and *adopting the shape* of no structure, of 'dream', of open space.

When we do this, we feel the 'push back' of existing structures. It is tempting to use effort to push through this, but that's a mistake. It's not actually 'push back' you are experiencing; rather you're just becoming more aware of the existing structures. Asserting something makes you intensely aware of the contrast between your current beliefs and the fact you are asserting. Persist, and the enfolded traces will dissolve; the implicate order will move towards the shape you are intending.

... ...

> Q: I think everyone is always intending, but in different ways.

I know what you mean by that. By my formulation above, I'd say that people are *implicitly* choosing to remain the same by not "redirecting" their path, because they don't update their "enfolded schema" as I've described. They are not *actively* intending therefore. Or worse: they are affecting it unwittingly by generating thoughts from ignorance! Mostly though, everyone is just experiencing the unfolding of their current direction, forever unadjusted.

Okay, that's my best attempt at describing my thinking so far. Keen for any input or disagreement, alternatives!

> Q: I believe it's possible to manifest in a way that doesn't create any habits.

I do too. By using absolutely no effort, we leave no traces. How to do this? Edit the structure of the implicate level, with no attempted forcing of the explicate.

> Q: Also, I don't think there's a sharp division between beliefs and experiences. That is, I'm not convinced there's a sharp division between the implicate level and the explicate level.

There isn't. In reality, they are single swirling intertwined process, like waves bouncing off waves. The explicate and implicate are both just patterns in consciousness, but the implicate level is the "timeless level" whereas the explicate level is the "unfolded now".

And you are experiencing your beliefs directly all the time in terms of a subtle "background knowing-feeling". The ongoing sensory moment is really a shape-changing time-based aspect of time-less belief: they are really all one pattern.

>Q: I don't use the word intention the way you use it here because the implication is that relaxation is non-intentional

Because my definition is that "any change from the way things are going is an intentional act", that's not a problem for me. But in fact, you can find yourself going to lie down and relax, and it wasn't deliberately intended - in the sense that is just flowed from your current momentum.

Everything that happens and everything you do is always just flowing from your current momentum. Unless you are constantly re-intending. Which would be a sign of a lack of faith, really.

> Q: what I was saying above about being able to manifest without creating habits or immediately drop all forms of conceptual momentum if I choose.

If you manifest by insert single-event facts into the implicate level (i.e. declare a truth, make a change at the non-sensory level) then you are not creating habits - you are "amending the blueprint" directly. So, you might

think there'd be two ways to change a habit. If you keep performing an action, that will change a habit by gradually leaving a trace. Alternatively, you can reach into the structure of habits itself, and change it directly. Magick is about the latter.

Can we avoid creating traces simply by deciding not to; by remaining in a "dropped, open state" at all times?

> >Q: I think the manifestation of all of our beliefs (felt truths?), whether new or old, is intentional. But, I understand how your use of the word works in the perspective you have outlined here.

There's no good word really. The essence is "things continue in the direction they are going, in accordance with established habits, unless you use Will to edit your implicate level". You can say that all things that subsequently arise from a change in direction are "intentional" in that you chose the direction, but that's not how I've been using the word.

> >Q: ["Mostly though, everyone is just experiencing the unfolding of their current direction, forever unadjusted."]; I don't like the way this and the whole deterministic language sounds. I think that people are living freely in the context of freely adopted commitments and habits.

This is where we differ, and I think it's very important to the idealist/non-dual/dream-like worldview. Once things are rolling in a certain direction, then your experience *is* deterministic. You are however free to intervene and redirect at any time, but often you won't. You will "have the experience of making choices" but you won't really be actively interfering in their occurrence. They "choose" how to practice, but really they are just acting consistently with their current direction.

They no more "choose" than they choose the beating of their heart and the flow of their blood and the growth of their fingernails. It's all happening from and in alignment with their "enfolded schema" at the implicate level. Acting consistently with one's Current Nature isn't a choice. The only true free will we have is to change our nature, and to stop interfering all the time (if we do that). Neville Goddard had a stab at a similar world view. Just to give air to another way of wording it, here's a bit of cut-and-paste of the relevant passage in one of his books:

> ["MANY persons, myself included, have observed events before they occurred; that is, before they occurred in this world of three dimensions. Since man can observe an event before it occurs in the three dimensions of space, life on earth must proceed according to plan, and this plan must exist elsewhere in another dimension and be slowly moving through our space. If the occurring events were not in this world when they were observed, then, to be perfectly logical, they must have been out of this world. And whatever is there to be seen before it occurs here must be "Predetermined" from the point of view of man awake in a three-dimensional world. Thus the question arises: "Are we able to alter our future?"
>
> My object in writing these pages is to indicate possibilities inherent in man, to show that man can alter his future; but, thus altered, it forms again a deterministic sequence starting from the point of interference—a future that will be consistent with the alteration. The most remarkable feature of man's future is its flexibility. It is determined by his attitudes rather than by his acts. The cornerstone on which all things are based is man's concept of himself. He acts as he does and has

> the experiences that he does, because his concept of himself is what it is, and for no other reason. Had he a different concept of self, he would act differently. A change of concept of self automatically alters his future: and a change in any term of his future series of exper-iences reciprocally alters his concept of self. Man's assumptions which he regards as insignificant pro-duce effects that are considerable; therefore man should revise his estimate of an assumption, and recognize its creative power. All changes take place in consciousness. The future, although prepared in every detail in advance, has several outcomes. At every moment of our lives we have before us the choice of which of several futures we will choose."
>
> -- Excerpt from *Out of this World*, Neville Goddard]
>
> > Q: By relaxation and effort I meant not physical relaxation or effort, but mental relaxation or effort – I think what I'm referring to here is akin to what you are calling flowing with momentum v. re-intending.

Yes. They're probably related though: physical tension (being made of mind too) probably gets in the way of the other.

> > Q: I think this is what I'm trying to say along the lines that you think in. Basically, we don't have to maintain stable traces (what I call habits, I think) and only adjust those maintained/stable traces when we manifest making deliberate decisions.

Right!

> > Q: I think that all choices and free interventions and redirections are in a sense unfolding expressions of intent/will similar to the way that habits are unfolding expressions of intent/will.

So, this is a tricky area. Can we run over it a few times? I'm think that there are two parts:

- When I "make a decision", that is a bit of "thought theatre" where I appear to mull things over. Really, that's just stuff happening along existing lines. I'm not actually intervening in the path.
- When I "redirect", I am actively "changing my shape" or changing my nature such that subsequent manifestations will be in line with that.

Now, I will always make a choice that is in line with my Nature - so that is deterministic - however, the options that appear to me do so *creatively* and cannot be predetermined - so that is *non*-deterministic. (That's why we are free.)

> >Q: Tulpas

Never felt the urge, but came across the topic and found it fascinating. Particularly the idea that our own personality "in our heads" could be classed as just "the first tulpa", spontaneously created as a response to interactions in childhood. What you "really are" is the aware space behind that; "you" are just an experience you're having. Identifying with one "tulpa" or another is arbitrary. So people could create a new tulpa, and

then shift their identification from their default personality to this. (Probably not recommended. Who wants to become a toy stuffed snake for the rest of their life? ;-)

> Q: I think that you are the path. I think that making a decision comes in context of thinking, imagining, and contemplating. That relationship is intentional - it's a manifestation of your will.

The 'thoughts that appear' are in line with your 'underlying Will' - let's call it your *current nature*. But you do not deliberately choose them or control the process. It's just an experience.

> Q: When I'm walking on a trail and I come to a fork, I'm not just responsible for the first step I take down one of the forks. I can always stop, turn around, wander into the woods, whatever I want to do. Every step is intentional and my responsibility. Similarly, every thought, action, and decision is intentional and my responsibility.

Basically, when you *do* intervene, you can say that subsequent events are your responsibility and that by making an intervention at some point, you "intended" the path that resulted - because you never interrupted it.

We're saying the same thing, it's just that I'm emphasising that it is very rare that we actually decide/act. Mostly we just experience the unfolding results of our current path.

- Your world unfolds deterministically from its current point.
- However, you can "intervene" at any moment to change its direction, to set it on a different path. (Other words for "intervene" might be to "re-direct" or "intend" or "decide". However, most words have *non-deliberate-action* meanings too, so it can be confusing.)
- The fact that you can intervene at any point means that you are responsible for what occurs, and could be said to have "intended" the outcomes *even though you didn't consciously choose the details of those outcomes*.

I don't think we have an essential nature. If we have a nature, it is infinite freedom. No choice is deterministic, it is volitional.

Our essential nature is wide open unstructured space, yes. However, from very early in our experience we accumulate "patterns". Probably from our acquisition of a body structure as a foetus onwards, perhaps even earlier in the form of some 'felt structure' from simply having a presence in the world.

What people call "True Will" or "True Nature" is really the structure or pattern we've inherited simply by appearing in (or *as*) a world such as this. Further patterns get laid on top. Stripping the secondary patterns returns us to our natural place as a being-of-this-world. Stripping *that* back, leads us to absolute open freedom.

> Q: If we have a nature, it is infinite freedom. No choice is deterministic, it is volitional. Even if it is in line with my presently maintained commitments and habits, it is still intentional.

Hopefully, we've got to the bottom of that earlier in this reply? If not, tell me.

> Q: Deterministic is a word generally used to refer to the idea that something is externally determined and out of control. Unless you mean that I determine those choices.

I mean "deterministic" more in the philosophical/scientific sense. I mean that, once a path has been set in motion, it will follow a cause-effect narrative just like dominoes falling down. This will continue until a conscious entity intervenes and redirects the flow to a different path. Most people do not make interventions; their choices are simply experiences along the same path.

> Q: Unless you mean that I determine those choices.

It's a tricky area. We don't determine the *options* but we choose *which option to follow*. What saves us is that there is a creative aspect: At any point (once you are free from being a particular "person") you can summon fresh, creative *options* to choose from - options that could not be predicted in advance, direct from the infinite creative fountain of background awareness.

That is where we get our real freedom. Freedom to choose amongst the options we see is one level of freedom - freedom to create new options that could not be predicted is a whole different level. (Obviously, the new options come from 'the whole universe' rather than 'the personality', so it's a matter of contribution. All options come from 'structure' of one sort or another.)

> Q: [On the "first tulpa":] I think this is a fascinating idea, a great point I never thought about before. I'd be interested if you wrote out your thoughts on this in more detail and made a post.

I'm trying to tie together pattern formation, "learning", personalities and world formation at the moment. If I get it sounding reasonable and coherent, I'll be doing a post on it definitely. I'd like to follow the full story from empty space to randomness to patterns to structure to world, and the implications for "me", "the world" and for "magick".

This would involve nailing the above stuff in terms of language too (which is the problem I/we have more than anything, rather than the actual content of our ideas).

Lots of people play with the free will vs determinism thing. You can short-circuit it by saying: "I have the freedom to intervene according to my own interests, based on the information available to me, and that's good enough." It then becomes about how much information you have, and whether you have a "gap between impulses" which lets you intervene - which is where freedom to summon options and choose between them lies, and is a matter of (dis-)identification with mind, body and (re-)identification with awareness.

[...]

Related thoughts, that occur to some people when they have expanded insight: If we've got it all figured out, with absolute power, what's the point in going on?

Reply to “Some ideas I've been contemplating recently.”

> >But appearances are not genuine....

Maybe: We tend to confuse immediate sensory experience with "how things are" - we imagine that the world and universe are extended out in the same way, beyond our immediate line of sight. In actuality, the sensory experience is an "unpacking" of an *aspect* of the whole pattern, from the background into the senses. It is a floating mirage. For instance, there is no "space" or extension other than the *experience* of space and extension.

We confuse ourselves by paying attention to some aspects of experience more than others: we prioritise images, sounds and textures, largely because they can be conceptualised (can be rendered as "made of parts" and discussed). We view these as "real". This is similar to how the scientist focuses on those aspects of experience which are quantifiable, and effectively ignores those which cannot be abstracted. It only takes a moment of pause and calm to realise that your reality is always that of the whole - of an open awareness in which the entire universe is dissolved and present (non-spatially, non-temporally) - and that the momentary sensory experiences which arise from and 'float within it' are simply where your attention happens to be on the pattern.

Absolutely *any* experience - of a body, of a mind, of a world - is *within* that awareness and therefore there is no container which holds you; what you truly are always extends beyond the walls of any boundary you may experience or imagine.

This is true of everyone. All apparent experiences of *being-a-person* (TriumphantGeorge, cosmicprankster420, ava_satana, Nefandi, and so on) are simply a transient sensory unfolding accompanied by a *felt-knowledge* associated with that perspective. These moments are always present and available in the background, parallel-simultaneously. Everyone all-at-once, you might say, but nobody-really.

> >This isn't an insight into conceptual elaboration, such as seeing an image and then thinking...

I'd say we don't really think that stuff, we *feel-know* it as part of the experience, *with* it.

> >We only see what appears to be an appearance, when nothing appears at all.

You'll perhaps need to clarify what you mean. At its core what I'm saying is: there is no "behind" to experiences. Neither for the "red with context and associations and conceptual meaning" experience nor the more simple "visual red" experience for those who are able to settle to that . However...

Of course, everything is nothing at all fundamentally, but that's like saying waves are just water - they do exist in their context, as themselves, relatively speaking.

> >I say "think" to imply that it's a mental process over which we have creative control. . . We just imagine we do.

Well, as you know, we can say "we imagine it" for everything, because that's effectively the whole deal: sensory experience is ongoing creation-discovery, depending on perspective.

> >I don't think you even understood anything I said.

Quite possibly. Perhaps you'd like to take a stab at being clearer? ;-) Let's have a go then: by "pre-qualia" you mean?

What it makes me think of, is the background formatting that comes before sensory experience. The 'structure', if you like, that divides experience into images, sounds, textures, and the rest. (A structure which is of course immersed in many other structures, all of which amount to the constraining of potential into our formatted experience.)

> >If you think you're discovering, it means there is substance "out there" that is "just so."

It's correct that there's no "out there", but there can be an "in here" for as long as you 'hold onto' your world. There *is* a persistence and stability to experience, because once something is discovered (which means "created by implication") then it becomes a *fact-of-the-world*.

Of course, this means nothing more than the pattern that you sprung into being is now hanging around in the background. The sensory experience of a tree doesn't correspond to a "real solid tree" of the form of the experience; rather, it's an experience sprung from a background pattern, a memory trace you might say, which is not tree-experience-shaped either, but is nevertheless the persisting aspect of/for that experience. A dissolved *fact-of-the-world*, as I said. If you detach from those subtle background patterns, then they too become flexible. The more you release a hold or an effort to change, the more power you have over those 'facts'.

So -

> >Purple isn't purple. Circles aren't circular.

I'm not sure in what sense you mean this. "Purple" is the experience of purple. "Circles" are the experience of circles. When instances are not being experienced, they are not coloured or shaped, they are dimensionless facts.

> >Even just having a sense that what your doing can be characterized as "discovery" is already a blockage. You don't have to discover anything even.

You are correct that we have to be careful how we think of this: I say "creation by implication" as a definition, so as to avoid the idea that things are "already there". I'm suggesting that 'people' should replace their idea of "discover" with that. We do have to account for the fact that whenever we look, an experience is *apparently* waiting for us. (What appears is in line with our beliefs, expectations, knowledge and intention. In a sense, it is not even created therefore, but we need some way to conceptualise it and that is the lesser evil.)

> >I was thinking the opposite. Make yourself utterly intimate with those backgrounds and start seeing them as your own private thoughts.

I think both approaches probably lead to the same outcome:

By detaching, your attention naturally opens out, instead of being focused as a small part and *thinking* that you are everything, you get the direct experience of obviously being everything and all those patterns being "in you" - automatically.

But asserting the idea of being those backgrounds is the same idea, and direct too.

> >Purple isn't an experience of purple. There is no standard of purpleness. When you see purpose it's not authentic. It's baseless, arbitrary, etc.

Okay, I'm *sure* we can't be disagreeing on this really. Perhaps it's language? If not, we should get to the bottom of it. By this:

> >"Purple" is the experience of purple

I don't mean that one is experiencing purple - I mean that the experiencing *is* purple and there is not purple other than experiencing (there is not "real purple"). In the same way as there are no "sights" to see, there is just *seeing*. We might call it *purpling*, perhaps.

> >We can deny the authenticity not just to that which we imagine behind the appearance, but even to the appearance itself. This is a more radical insight.

That seems fine. It follows, surely, even if one sees the construction as "fictitious and arbitrary" then the corresponding appearance (sensory experience) is even more so. The only thing that is truly "real" and authentic is - to be cheesy – *awareness*. You're right to emphasise the point. Many formulations correclty reach the conclusion that there is "no solid substrate", but then treat the dreamlike sensory experience as somehow being kinda solid in itself.

> >The problem with detaching is that if you think you've detached from something, you also think you've left it behind, and it's waiting for you "out there" to re-attach.

It's better perhaps to say "non-attached". What is meant, though, is that one isn't focused attentionally and so recognises directly the context of the patterns (ripples in the background, or however we might want to phase it). The point isn't to leave it behind, the point is that having disengaged with it (stopping taking it seriously or opposing it), it shifts and dissipates more easily in response to intention.

> >So you're still keeping the aesthetic aspect sacred, which is exactly where we differ. I no longer want to keep the aesthetic sacred.

Hmm, I'm not sure I am. I see the aesthetic as a mirage associated with arbitrary patterning, and not distinct from it. But - I'll certainly admit that I drift in and out of directly noting that fact as I go about the day.

I'm clearer at what you're shooting for now.

"Blueness" is just formatting, patterning, in the same way as everything else - just as the apparent partitioning of experience into "images, sounds and textures" is. It's just that it's more subtle, and cannot be conceived of in isolation, so it's harder to "decide" that it's not-real in the same way (because when we think of the word "pattern" we think of spatial-ness).

(This is perhaps similar to the problem as we have when describing the fundamental situation: there is a *property* but it is not attached to a spatial or temporal aspect. The fundamental being a "nonmaterial material whose only property is *being-aware*". It is inconceivable.)

So, I'm saying that there is no difference between appearances and other structural patterning/formatting - however the limitations of thought mean that it's is hard to *think about* them in the same way.

We have a tendency to see apparent objects as being "built out of" colours, when the truth is more like it is a superposition of a "shape pattern" and a "colour pattern" on equal footing - i.e. both arbitrary and insubstantial.

In your playground metaphor, an intermingling of the "cube pattern" and the "castle pattern" would result in the final building pattern (appearance) in experience.

> Structures... a kind of abstract blockiness which isn't a structure, but a feeling.

We could use the word 'archetype' or 'form' I suppose. A 'feeling' is just as much a 'structure' as edges or shapes or colours. We might refer to it as something like a 'sensory aspect', perhaps.

> In other words, do you believe there is a standard of blueness? If yes, then you grant this quality Platonic realism.

In the same way that there is 'spatial extension' and instances and levels of spatial extension.

> >It's worse than that even. Even superposition is too neat, too organized compared to the ultimate truth.

Y'know... *metaphor*.

As far as I can see, there's no actual problem here. You're just getting hung up on the fact that certain parts of experience, once we tackle them, are revealed to be hard to conceptualise.

"Blue" has the same problem as "feeling" (in the non-texture sense) in that it can't be represented so easily in thought because in and of itself it lacks spatial and temporal extent, so we have to imagine a container of some sort and locate it within that (e.g. a "color spectrum" and so on).

> >So before you can doubt blueness, you first have to regard it as a structure.

No. In order to *talk* about it and *think* about it you have to regard it structurally (spatially). Recognising it as without foundation simply requires that you recognise it as one with the rest of experience.

> >You're right, but that's not what I wanted to talk about when I brought up that metaphor.

For sure, but it gets to the heart of it.

At the fundamental level, there is no "blueness", no "object". However, since we live in a world where there are archetypal patterns (call them what you want) in place and instances (which are themselves of the same sort), then it is convenient to highlight one aspect of this as the superposition of two patterns: one with a spatial aspect, one without.

If what you are wanting is that a metaphor which == how it really is, then in this case you're out of luck! :-)

Our thinking is itself constrained by our sensory modalities; we cannot normally think of something that could not be experienced, not without cheating with a container of some sort.

Does this summarise your thoughts:

> “Raw experience is still of a conceptual nature, and there are actually no sensory modalities. A color, say red, is itself conceptual. I don’t mean the word red or the idea of red, I mean the direct experience of redness itself, IS still conceptual in nature. The same goes for sound, touch, or any other appearance.”

Because that's pretty much how I see it, and it's the basis of the older formatted mind metaphor for experience. Everything is of the same nature, no matter what.

No, it's been interesting. And it's interesting how it's every hard to talk about things a this level, put them into language.

For instance, words like 'patterns' and 'structures' all imply a space-extended or time-extended aspect - but that's not what Im trying to say at all. (By the way, by 'metaphor' I ended up going right to basics: using the 'metaphor' of a structures for something that had no structure. That's how basic it got.)

When I talked of 'containers' and 'structures' I was talking about how we are forced to *think* about colours - even when there are no containers in actuality of course. We have reached the limits of what it is possible to conceive of, rather than directly have in experience.

I think in the end you have to simply *assert* that what you are calling appearances are just of the same 'stuff' as all the other *facts-of-the-world* - effectively, habits of experience with no solid backing.

[...]

I think maybe my other reply covers this. An experience or multiple experience doesn't imply a permanence of 'facts' or a deeper reality to them beyond appearance, it simply means that a pattern has been created. We change the 'fact' not the sensory mirage of the appearance - we go the 'long way round' or 'go underneath', to the root or truth of the appearance. The lingering pattern from which it springs. The trace the initial experience-on-demand ("creation by implication") left behind.

My inclination would be to start with something like: Infinite potential -> *passed through* patterns -> appearances

Where:

- Patterns are beliefs, expectations, knowledge & intentions (as we have previously established)
- **Appearances are "what's left".**

[...]

> >What you're proposing is a process of construction.

Actually, I was viewing it as a *subtraction of potential*. Hence, releasing one's attachment in reverse order (recognising the arbitrariness of each: appearances, then patterns) reveals the no-thing, everything, whatever behind it all.

> >Can we get to a "place" where nothing is left?

Oh, I think that's what I just did.

Reply to “But where did it all come from?”

Patterns upon patterns upon patterns, dissolved into awareness? Raw potentiality/creativity, filtered/shaped through accumulated patterns, resulting in (equating to) sensory experience. *All experience is therefore conceptual, archetypal*.

Also:

- Experiences leave traces which *in-form* subsequent experiences.
- Thinking is an experience which leaves traces similarly...

Where did these structures come from? Something akin to the way hypnagogic imagery turns into dream environments. There was an infinite amount of time for this to happen, of course.

All you need is randomness plus slight inertia.

TL;DR: **We are dreaming.**

As there is no solid substrate behind the scenes, we can dream anything - including being confused, or experiencing an 'illusion', or dissolving into non-dual awareness, or uncovering the Super-Real Truth Behind It All, which includes maybe even identifying a solid substrate behind the scenes...

But all of those are just more experiences; there is no real truth to be discovered, except to realise the arbitrariness of it. That is why seekers keep on seeking: because they have chosen to be seekers, by self-imagining or by it being implied in their actions. Freedom fighters have to fight for their freedom, by definition. The dream always arises "as if" your approach or assumptions are true, and any metaphors you adopt will reformat the world according to your new "understanding". If you instead simply rest a while, stop pushing and prodding, the dream settles somewhat, and things become clearer, the apparent environment's responsiveness more obvious.

You can't *not-dream* - so it's a case of choosing to have *sweet dreams*.

Reply to “Some reasons I hate this realm.”

Nice list. Wondering: If there is only one being, being the world, does most of this go away?

7) Magick is how the world works, right now. Perhaps: What you really mean is that you are displeased with previous results (established habits in experience) and wish they hadn't become so ingrained.

> “*If there is only one being, being the world, does most of this go away?*”; Hmm, I'm not sure what you're asking. Would you clarify?

Well, it seems churlish to complain about the details of one's own creation (following the subjective idealist angle of this subreddit). And your desire to "end up in a realm" seems quite passive?

> >That depends on how you understand magick. I understand magick to be direct acts of will that break the fundamental rules of convention: the laws of nature.

I'd go with something along the lines of: the process by which desired experiences come into being.

Past intentions create patterns which *may* place limits on the routes by which future intentions unfold. The results of previous magickal acts may become "ordinary" with time and familiarity, may even become so entrenched as to be called "laws".

> >I think if we define magick more broadly than this, then the word ceases to correspond to its conventional meaning, and starts to become indistinguishable from 'will/intent' in general.

I see where you're coming from. But I'm thinking that to separate the two in this way is a false dichotomy which might obscure the flexible nature of things - the mechanism and process is identical. The "rules of the realm" aren't rules/laws so much as habits, etc. Opening your hand and levitating are the same. But... one is less likely, *apparently*.

We can never know why we created a place as we created it, so that has to wait I suppose. But ...

Why do you think transforming yourself will allow you to leave this place? Or rather, that this is the way to get to another realm?

On the magick thing: You are correct of course on the distinction, but the humdrum and the strange arise by the same process, from and of the same origin. This matters because...

Who cares about "convention" and other people? If this is the realm that you created, then all that matters is what is conventional or frightening to you. The "normal" simply corresponds to habits you have developed, experiences you have fallen into repeating. The "esoteric" are just those that are less commonly experienced. There is no difference other than that.

So... the question to ask is, why have you fallen into treating some things as a big deal and not others? Is that perhaps the reason - the only reason - you find certain things more difficult? Are you effectively just procrastinating making "the jump" by presenting it to yourself as a challenge?

> >If I want to create and maintain a new realm, I have to change myself.

Might we rephrase it something like - "change the form that I have taken"?

> >Another reason they're difficult is because a part of me thinks it's dangerous to tamper with my mind in these ways. I'm not totally comfortable with and confident in my own mental power. I think I might go insane or hurt myself. Physicalism is still a deep habit I'm fighting against, even though I intellectually reject it.

Right, and that is where the stress comes in. I was conversing with someone the other day, about how "anything might be possible" but that we actually would often choose *not* to be able to just, say, command people or instantly teleport, because it would break our model of the world, our sense of stability and safety.

This is why I wondered about the "procrastination explanation". And that you might *want* it to be a slow, gradual, effortful, challenging process where you fiddle about and transform each subtle pattern and structure.

> >Habits don't usually just disappear, and I'm not sure I would want them to anyway.

The second clause is key. They can and do disappear instantly. And this realm disappears every time you dream or do an OBE. You could just not come back. You could create a persistent dream world and attach to it, or create a tulpa wonderland and swap places, and you're outta here. Or a 'dimensional jump'. They're all the same thing really.

Because by investigating and experimenting you're not *really* accomplishing anything except making yourself more comfortable with radical change (nothing wrong with this, it's a perfectly acceptable way to progress). What you are doing is "dreaming more experiences" for yourself, only these experiences are "about" uncovering how the world work and changing it.

You can't get away from dreaming (because you and the dream are the same thing) but you can dream anything at any time. The only trick is that you have to let go of dreaming that you are adjusting *this* dream, and you have to stop applying effort because it implies a certain sort of dream itself.

Someone asked my a short while ago if there was a 'cheat sheet' for using the 'Infinite Grid' metaphor, and I drew this up.

The Infinite Grid of All Possible Moments

Instructions

1. Detach / ‘Be the background awareness’
2. Absolute Allowing / ‘Let the world come to you’
3. Intend / ‘Decide upon and insert facts’

Notes

1. There is no fundamental structural pattern, no solid substrate; there is only being-aware.
2. What you are is that awareness, taking on the shape of experience.
3. You are experiencing your own mind: infinity as filtered through belief, expectation, knowledge & intention
4. Hence physical facts have dreamlike meanings.

5. (a) The passage of time is the trajectory of attention across a sequence of “moments”, or

(b) The passage of time is the unfolding of intention in experience.

6. Each experience is a sensory unpacking of the facts dissolved into awareness, as a moment.

7. Accessing a moment / fact allows us to adjust it.

8. Shifting attention and intention can allow us to ‘jump’ discontinuously to ‘distant’ moments.

9. (a) We don’t “do” things directly; rather, we “select experiences”.

(b) Intentions select experiences by filtering subsequent moments, not by causing anything

The key is the "allowing". Just as with visualisation or even daily perception, mastery involves coming to the stage where you let go and "let the world come to you". Effort prevents this, because it implies and creates a different experience.

>Not that I think instantaneous transformation is impossible, but it's not for me right now.

That's totally fine. And the exploration-investigation aspect is pretty good fun anyway.

You got infinite power. Get used to it. ;-)

Reply to “God is male; The Universe is female; The Self is the meeting of the two”

> >I found a simpler way of saying what I was saying. A Universe without a God doesn't exist; but a God without a Universe doesn't exist either.

Or: God cannot experience his existence without a universe, by shaping himself as a universe.

I guess: the world-as-metaphor - the whole of experience seems to be a play on opposites and reunification.

Reply to “Sensoria vs visualization.”

> >Another good question is, why is it so easy to imagine your dream world? Not this one, your sleeping dreams. That also is imaginary.

Yet, it's completely without effort. I was talking about this elsewhere, intention + automatic pattern completion, copy-pasted below. The point is, you shouldn't be doing much of anything with your conscious mind except "requesting" - effectively raising a part of a pattern, which then naturally "raises" the rest of it.

Excerpt:

Good point about "allowing" imagination/results. I learned visualisation from David Fontana's *The Meditator's Handbook* which basically amounts to:

- Regularly try to visualise various objects and environments.
- Eventually realise that it's not "you" that creates the images. They arise in response to you intending to have them - if you allow this to happen.

Relevant quote:

> Visualization: A Key to the Inner World
>
> . . . [When visualizing people] At this point, notice the creative power of the mind. If you have worked through each of the visualization exercises I've given, mastering one before going on to the next, you will find that, as in dreams, the mind creates the face for you without conscious effort on your part.

The world around you *might* be described as appearing in the same way. Dissolved within you are beliefs, expectations, knowledge, all sorts of accumulated archetypal patterns and so on, which might be said to "filter infinity" into superimposed patterns (facts-of-the-world as 'dissolved into the background'). Your intention is a "selection" from the resulting possible patterns.

You do not need to control the details because - like the smell of a flower bringing forth all the related memories and knowledge associated with it - the result is *already part of the extended pattern with which the intention is associated*. In other words: Intention is a static selection mechanism; it is an additional 'fact' you add to your world. This is why "allowing" needs to be the basic approach: you are not creating an image, you are 'letting form' or 'letting through'.

> >The whole point with visualization is to begin bringing subconscious/unconscious capabilities into the conscious domain.

Why would you want to bring things into the conscious (actually: present moment expanded sensory) domain? That's like people who want to be directly aware of all the "steps in between". But there aren't any steps, unless you are experiencing them. If you get whatever you want, that's enough. There is no secret mechanism behind it. There is no "how it works" to anything.

The "point" of visualisation is... to summon desired sensory experiences.

The so-called "unconscious" is perfectly present at all times as the background to conscious experience. It just isn't experienced as unfolded image-sound-texture. It's the stars in the sky vs the midday sun.

[...]

And this is a key issue, right? Say you have the ability to create a fully convincing visualisation of an army of angelic warriors, floating in the sky above you.

If everyone can see those warriors, you're God.
If only you can see those warriors, you're mad.

> >Right, so I'd rather aim to be God than mad.

Good choice! :-)

Thing is, it's how deep you go to make the changes I think. Mild autosuggestion and you are creating hallucinations for a localised self (dreaming you are mad: oops). Deeper, deeper and you are creating hallucinations for consciousness as a whole (dreaming the whole world is mad: fine).

> >So many dilemmas of free will vs determinism when you get into that though.

Don't worry about it. You always have free will relative to the "dimension" you are standing on, which corresponds to the one you can't perceive at all. For instance, you are having a 4D experience of a 3D world right now, which means that you are "standing" on and intending from 5D. (Although actually you are awareness and beyond dimensions fundamentally, but this is a convenient way to think about it.)

> >I questioned how this could be. How could some other being be having free will, but also be synchronistically answering my inquiries?

It happens all the time. One may think of it as *over-determination*. That everything is already taken into account. So, the conversation in the bus is about whatever it is *and* is about your situation *and* is about the guy next to you's situation, all happening simultaneously. Since this is a headache, it's easier to just say: look, waking life is just as dream-like and metaphorical as dreaming life. It is filled with *personal meaning* because it basically *is* yourself as projected out.

Imagine that everything that you are is folded down into a little, tiny speck in your heart area. But what this does is, it projects out in all directions a metaphorical representation of you. You are therefore literally experiencing yourself, exploring yourself as you go about your day.

If you want to include other people in this, imagine they too have the same setup, so that everyone's projections overlap "holographically" as it were, and the final result is meaningful for all. (You can skip that part because everyone is all you anyway, in effect.)

> >How are you picturing this 5D world to be?

So for a 4D space (which you are viewing from a 5D stance) you can see it as the Infinite Grid metaphor I posted previously. If you then visualise each small square as being a tube, then you can go further, etc. But really there's no need, because we've already chosen one organising concept ("moments") and said that the

grid is infinite. See yourself as the vast conscious space in which the (determined) grid appears, is dissolved in, and imagine traversing the moments by unfolding them one by one (free will).

Remember though, there is no dimensionality "really"; it's just a way of conceptualising things and formatting experience so that you can contemplate it and formulate intentions. There is no time or space aside from your *experience* of time or space. There is no spatially-extended world beyond theses walls; the world is instead a list of facts dissolved into the background, unfolded into/as the senses as you explore it with your gaze.

>How does everyone have free-will if they are me?

Other people: Think of them as "Extended Persons" with many aspects, only one of which is being experienced in-the-senses by you. But really it is easier to think of them as parts of you. Or: That every moment, every perspective, every possibility will have a turn at being experienced.

As you see, it depends how you look at it: in-time, or from outside of time, etc. There give been reports by people of everyone suddenly looking round...

>It's like a choose your own adventure story book.

Good metaphor! Everyone "on Earth" is reading the same book simultaneously, but they had different starting pages and take varying routes. :-)

>...and therein lies the paradox.

Right. Eventually you'd choose limits again. You don't *really* want all your friends and family to be puppets, do you? Most people just opt for a little bit of influence in times of need. The very occasional "I command that this will happen", and a guaranteed result. If you do bring about a massive discontinuity, would you want to remember it? For instance, jump back to correct a mistake? I think that once you'd done the deed, you'd opt for ignorance again.

>Do you mean looking around or looking rotund?

Ha, rotund, good! I mean, people who have "waking up" moments and it seems like everything goes quiet and the other people notice, it goes all *Inception*. The puppets pause...

Relevant because it's a flicker of loosening grip and focus, and yet being the whole environment.

>No, but I've come to the conclusion that I want my body to be my puppet.

Easy: Relax. Decide that your body is a "shell". Tell it to do something and let it move by itself - e.g. "body, go to the shops" or "body, resurrect". Simply be the experiencer. Build from there.

Reply to “Differences between Oneirosophy and New Age”

> >What's different I realized is that new age can have a quasi materialistic bent to its working...

Yes, there's like an acceptance of 'this' but not of 'that' - as if there's a requirement for some solidity to base the esoteric stuff on. Which isn't the case. Everything gets much simpler if you accept that everything is non-material and aware, and therefore infinitely flexible.

> >If the world is truly a dream things like chemicals in the drinking water or having the right crystals in the room should not be an aid or a detriment unless you decide it so, all is perception.

I was recently reading a book on "Ho'oponopono", quite new-agey (albeit describing a traditional Hawaiian approach apparently) but with some universal ideas buried in it. Anyway, at one point our main character in this asks to go to a burger bar. Our author is surprised - surely this unhealthy food is a bad idea? The response is that he 'sends it love before he eats it'.

Now, that sounds ridiculous, but then you realise what he's *really* saying is that he is refusing to accept the idea that the burger is bad for him. He isn't cleansing it of bad energies or whatever; he is cleansing *himself* of his own *causal opinion* that this will do him harm.

> >Simultaneously, it is becoming apparent to me that much of what before I would feel very much a victim of, now I simply take in stride and learn from.

The larger idea is that we can cower and "be small" within our world-experience, or we can *assert* and become it - in which case it is within us. When the world is within us, it is not made of "things" but of "meaning", and events unfold according to their meaning.

If burgers and coughing "mean" to us that health is affected, it will be. However, if we note that burgers and coughing are merely images in awareness then they don't *inherently* mean anything, and we can update any meaning those ideas have inherited from our past assumptions.

I guess you could call this "Active Being". In many traditions we are taught non-attachment and acceptance. This alone reduced the effect of such things. However, we *do* have the ability to "reformat experience" and change the "rolling theory" we are living with - interjecting when we spot a tweak that needs to be made, and letting be at other times.

> >this is where the idea of gods or the hga becomes useful.

This is a good point - that if you can't quite persuade yourself that "little you" has all this power, then you can outsource it as a way of convincing yourself it's possible. But that is what you are doing: creating-adjusting by implication. It's pretty hard to convince yourself that: a) you can completely cheat the game and, b) that cheating the game is a 'good idea' or morally 'allowed'. And doing things by direct assertion (including 'overwriting yourself') maybe the most direct and it does work, but it involves at least temporarily leaving personhood behind, which is a pretty big emotional hurdle (it's "death"!)

Reply to “Pain doesn't hurt anymore”

Do you feeling more generally detached and less present in your body? Do you feel more 'localised' in your head area?

Not saying this is you, but - - - One reaction people can have to emotional trauma is that they withdraw their 'presence' from their body; they become remote from both emotional and physical sensation. Any distraction from the 'avoided area' can come across as having ambiguous meaning, anything intense that breaks through can seem pleasurable - e.g. Being forcibly hugged really intensely, etc.

Mostly, it is that for such a deadened person, any intense sensation can give a feeling of 'aliveness' again. In other words, if that is you, then this isn't a good thing. Spiritual learning allows you to feel things fully and accept them as *sensations*; it doesn't literally reduce the sensation itself or deaden the natural response. 'Letting go' and 'mindfulness' exercises might assist, although you might find them initially unpleasant and make you feel vulnerable, because you will be opening yourself up to sensations you've not been with for a while.

Reply to “Everything is real, everything is unreal, or everything simply is?”

It depends on the perspective. Everything is unreal in the sense that it is not what we assume - no solid objects extended in space, actually patterns in dissolved awareness. But they are real in terms of *being patterns*.

So perhaps it's better to dodge the question and just say that everything is transparent and dreamlike?

From there it follows that as there is no solid substrate, everything is temporary and flexible, and because to experience something you must be it, all experiences and therefore the world are contained within you.

"Real" and "unreal" means the world experience is being separated into two categories. But really, *all* experience is made from patterns of the same thing (awareness).

The distinction between the two is, on examination, usually down to stability and persistence, and perhaps location - that transient thoughts are "not real" (and over here)whereas the room around you hangs around and is therefore "real" (and over there).

If real = an independent physical material, then nothing is real.
If real = awareness, then everything is real.

From a /r/Psychonaut post:

> ***Nefelibata***
>
> Definition: A cloud walker; One who lives in the cloud of their own imagination or dreams, or one who does not abide by the precepts of society, literature, or art; An unconventional, unorthodox person.
>
> Pronunciation: ne-fe-LE-ba-ta

Reply to “Technique for developing intellectual lucidity”

[cosmicprankster420 (OP): I think that no matter how far or how deep we push our consciousness into the insane, the unbelievable, and the non logical there will always be those ideas and dreams that ultimately baffle us and come across as nonsense. Everyone likes to ponder the peculiarities of scientology, ufo cults, NWO conspiracies and such but is there utility beyond this beyond schizophrenic fantasy or amusing ideology? I like to spend time browsing these weird and peculiar dream worlds because it for some reason gives me a sense of lucidity, but I never really realized why until just now.

Depending upon how one perceives things there will be different reactions to claims such as reptilians putting micro chips in your brain. The objectivist reacts to claims such as this as ridiculous in comparison to their own worldview. The subjectivist on the other hand does not have an objective worldview to compare this reptilian fantasy too, yet the logical part of their mind cannot accept this. So the effect that takes place here is you are exploring a dream/ideology you know is not objectively real but at the same time you don't reject said ideology either and just explore the particular dreamscape as it is without judgement, which creates the similar feeling one has of being in a lucid dream. But in order for this effect to be successful you cannot have another dream/worldview to compare to, you must let it sit in the void totally as it is. This is why materialists who explore weird belief structures don't have a sense of lucidity when doing this because they are comparing x(weird belief) to y (perceived sane belief). What i'm saying is recognize the weirdness of X but do not compare it to any kind of Y. You don't want to fully believe or disbelieve in X, its kind of similar to Robert anton wilsons general agnosticism but taken to the next level. So here is what you do. Find a book, online community, of an ideology that you could never possibly find yourself believing in under any circumstances (If you cant do that make up your own) read it but neither believe what you are reading nor disbelieve, neither agree nor disagree. Just enjoy the novelty of the strange exotic dream, and you will notice a strange sense of lucidity takes place.

To make this more evident I will give you an example. Earlier today I was browsing a subreddit known as digital cartel. Its a subreddit of a man who seems to be suffering from schizophrenia thinks he is jesus and that the NWO Is trying to control everyones mind. I was reading a section about how he was talking about how secret socieites have been planting micro chips into EVERYONES (literally every single person) for over a thousand years. This is something most rational skeptical minds of the mainstream world would not be able to accept, but instead of going with my reflexive Bullshit stance or to believe it forthright, I kind of just flowed through the ideas without emotionally or intellectually investing in them any way. One of the goals of this subreddit is to bypass this sort of objective mind that prevents us from seeing the dream like nature of things, yet it seems it can be used for our advantage in certain circumstances such as this. Eventually if one understands this state of consciousness it can be expanded into ideologies/dreams that seem more solid and more reasonable. But I think those who are new to the oneirosophic path should start with stuff that they in no way could believe in from the context of a conventional mind.]

One things that comes from viewing the *nature* of experiencing as being fundamentally true, but the the *specific content* of experiences as being relatively true, is that you are in a state of permanent "open verdict". We see that *all* worldviews are "castles in the sky", in the sense that they are coherent and self-consistent, but *none* of them have a solid substrate as their foundation. One part of a worldview is true in the context of the other parts; none of the parts are true fundamentally; there is no privileged *content-based* platform from which other content may be judged.

The question then becomes not whether it is *possible that* reptiles are running the world, but whether it is *possible to have an experience "as if"* reptiles are running the world. (Turquoise says yes.)

Reply to “Understanding Beta, alpha, theta, and delta mind states in an oneirosophic context.”

Could we think of the brainwaves as the 3rd-person subjective image of a 1st-person subjective experience? Is the difference between states then a different between attentional styles? Two general styles:

- A diffuse, open attentional style is a detached one where you let the world experience come to you. You are settled into the broadest state. This is an acceptance of existing patterns though non-resistance.
- In contrast, a highly focussed, narrow attention style involves a "gripping" onto a pattern. If this is a pattern of existing experience, this this increases the intensity of the pattern within focus, but also preventing its change.

However, either style can be used to effect change:

- An open-detached style (non-clinging to existing pattern) can allow intentions to ripples into effect easily. You are not "holding onto" existing patterns, so they can reform without resistance.
- A narrow-focussed style, when focussed on the desired pattern rather than an existing pattern, can also be a mechanism for change.

Implicitly, both approaches can amount to releasing a hold on present patterns and transferring experience to a desired pattern. The open approach is far less stressful though, and you can have a focussed *experience* within an open *state*.

I'd say the open detached style is definitely the one to go for, because you can (potentially) live every moment this way. By "letting the world come to you" you can remain completely relaxed. If you don't even interfere with the shifts of your own attention (which eventually settle anyway), you naturally become aware of the background space including the place where "you" are meant to be.

The narrow-focussed bang has been used in magickal techniques as a quick way of forcing temporary detachment while holding an intention, to "release" it. But surely it's far better to be completely open and "ask and receive" instead - for everyday body movement and thinking, not just "special efforts".

I guess it's about resisting the urge to want to *push* and feel yourself *doing* things.

[...]

Can you instead put aside those thoughts and then, rather than de-conditioning, leave them alone and choose to *assert* your preferred metaphysics and live from that?

Reply to “Choices, choices... Symmetry vs asymmetry in a worldview.”

Note sure if this'll make sense but -

Can you get out of this by identifying with the "ground of being" (even just conceptually) and seeing Nefandi and Everyone Else as on the same level? As the ground, you are never elitist or non-elitist. If Nefandi plays the "educating" part or not, it is of no consequence in the larger play. Nefandi is not Godlike, but you-as-the-ground is. Nefandi has no obligations to educate unless he is so moved. And when he is so moved will be when it is the appropriate thing to do. Because the ground will have shifted him.

Y'know, maybe this is an intuitive timing thing.

Well, I tried. :-)
It's not an easy thing.

And the answer is... *dream-cake!*

Inevitably. But maybe the idea that you have to choose is wrong. You can flip between Nefandi and The Ground and between one approach and the other. Maybe the problem is in felt need to choose? I'm a strong opponent of the need to "have an opinion" in times when you don't actually need to act upon a view.

I'm sort of "being the ground" but guiding the experience *as* TG. Sometimes one thing seems appropriate, sometimes another. Usually neither was appropriate. ;-)

You are the All-Knowing Nefandi - He came from The Ground, and The Ground arises within Him. There is nothing He cannot accomplish in His World!

Maybe. ;-)

Oneness and solipsism are two extremes, but are in effect the same position, if we avoid talking about a *personal* mind. But the idea that you are bound to one or the other - or that either is "correct" is... incorrect. The whole point of "the dream" is that not only can you *pretend* as though something intermediate is the case, you can have it *be so*.

Maybe it *can* but then you don't come back. If, say, you committed 100% to not being a perspective anymore, you wouldn't be "there" anymore.

Although with so much accumulated patterning, there always *some* level of movement and change I'd say - even if it then takes "10,000 years" to come out of the condition.

[...]

[[3man: *“But there is one tiny little problem. If I want to see myself as a ground of being, then I fundamentally can't equate myself to anything that manifests within me. This perspective introduces a profound asymmetry and on a relative level, when I practice this, it inclines me toward the elitist tendencies.”*; I'm not sure I understand this.

"So if I see someone saying truly dumb things, normally I would feel obligated to correct this, not at all because of any sense of superiority, but the opposite, from a sense that if I can understand it, so can they, and if I deserve to know something, so do they."; Ok now I see what you mean.

Upon reading your post I find that I resonate with this egalitarian view and have also been drifting away from it, but in this way:

We know the world is all mind, or as I like to think of, all heart, with the mind as simply the television that streams the data to the screen of consciousness. With this in mind, or in heart, what I can deduce is that it doesn't really matter that I help each and every person get on my level, and in fact is a huge waste of effort and goes to show that I really don't understand myself at all if I feel that to be necessary. We are all already equal in the sense that we are all already perfectly free. There is nothing I can do to raise anyone else, we are already at the pinnacle of existence. It just so happens that with our freedom we are experiencing different experiences. I look to the right and there is an advert for /r/lego so I'll use lego as an example. Let's say I'm playing with lego, and I realize that I don't have to follow the instructions. I realize that I'd rather build a garden of eden and not a tower of babylon (ok now I'm getting too charged with my example lol). I see this and I am glad. I have realized the freedom. Then I see someone else, this person is building the tower of babylon as per the instructions, but is clearly annoyed that they are doing so. Knowing that I am free, and that they too are free to build anything I say, hey, did you know you can build anything? They reply, "shut up look you made me mess up this part of the Tower of Babylon." So now I am annoyed, how dare this person not see I am freeing them? Alas, I was doing no such thing, they were already free to do whatever, but had chosen to build a Tower of Babylon. My interjection stood no chance of freeing them, and in fact, was only limiting them further. Only when someone comes to you asking for their freedom, can you remind them of it.

So, don't look at it as elitism, look at it as a completely level playing field. Everyone will remember their freedom eventually. At some point or another, I believe, they relinquished this memory willingly in order to experience something of a limitation. I don't believe that this is accidental, rather that it is purposeful and therefore we're only messing with their intentions if we try to remind them when they weren't asking.

Furthermore, what's of real importance is that you know you are free. Simply being free around others is going to encourage within them the knowledge of freedom. Needing to correct people and remind them they are free is not freedom. Needing to ignore people and not correct or remind them of freedom is not freedom. Freedom is not needing anything, and therefore being able to do anything.]]

[[AesirAnatman: *"This is slightly scary to type, but you know how some occultists say there are lots of fascists among the occultist crowd? Well, I am leaning anarchist, if anything, so the word "fascist" gives me the willies. And yet I've been slowly realizing how this might transpire. I'm even thinking, what if, horror, I become this fascist I despise? I hope not. But I certainly see how it can happen."*; I totally understand this. It's a dilemma I've thought a lot about. The more you lean toward pure individualism and total self-liberation, the more freedom you demand for yourself, the more potentially dangerous you become to others. There's nothing internal left (i.e. a sense of morality or duty to the community) to stop a self-liberated individual from exploiting and torturing others, if they so choose.

There's nothing stopping a libertine from being a sadist, a serial killer, or a pedophile other than their own disinterest. The question is, are you repressing a desire to control other people with violence? To dominate and hurt others? If so, then liberating yourself from community norms will liberate you to do as you really

desire to do. I am just now thinking that lucid dreaming might be a good way to explore these sorts of experiences, build tolerance to them, and learn how one feels about them - test out torturing a dream character. Go through that phase. Test out having sex with a dream child. Etc. Etc.

That's pretty uncomfortable to say, but it seems like a good way to push your inner boundaries and de-condition aversion for those activities without doing them 'for real'. Then, you can give up on them, assuming they don't interest you. But if they do interest you? Hmm. That's scary to think about. I'm pretty confident I wouldn't find pleasure in either of those things, but even admitting that I have the capacity to be a being that enjoys those things gives me this wormy, insect-y, parasitic feeling.

"The good news is, as long as one is even slightly interested in any kind of even intermittent companionship, there are good reasons not to do anything immoral, or at least, not as a habit."; Cause it will piss off your companion if you act immoral toward them on accident because it's habitual?

Anyway, I've been thinking about this whole question of living exclusively for my own desires or living for the desires of a community of beings. This whole asymmetry v. symmetry question. I'm still stuck on the central question I mentioned in my main reply to this post about developing sensitivity and compassion or developing callousness and indifference.

If I continue developing compassion, then I will move deeper into veganism, a sort of political communist-anarchism and trying to regulate my life to be highly environmentally friendly. But, at some level, if this is a dream, then those are only prudent acts in context of certain aims and game rules. And I don't like this game.

Why would I constrain myself to codes of morality for others when I'm a god and others are gods and we're all responsible for our own realities. That really seems to lend itself toward cold-heartedness. I don't see that as a problem, necessarily.

I was thinking, in a video game, I've got no problem killing other players' characters or having my game character eat other characters' dead bodies or having a position of political power or serving some king etc. Usually, I think that's because there's no 'real' suffering in a video game (only people being upset with the fake game), and no real life at risk. But now I'm starting to think that's the case irl. Granted, there's no one who has to play the 'ordinary townsfolk characters'/serfs/slaves in a video game. - Maybe you could develop a view of slavish people as NPCs while viewing more liberated people as PCs, haha.

As a side note, I've been thinking about intelligence in relation to this and your concern for yourself as a fascist v. an anarchist. (This thought emerged out of observing /r/sorceryofthespectacle and /r/DarkEnlightenment).

I realized there are essentially two dominant motivations an individual can have regarding politics, following the theme of your post. Selfish motivations and community motivations. Selfish motivations are a mode where an individual supports political views or accepts political positions because it will be most in their individual interest. This view can tend toward anarchism or fascism or capitalism or anything else depending on the position of and desires of and self-views (specifically whether they view themselves as intelligent/capable of intelligence or not) of the selfish individual and what will work best for them in those circumstances.

Community motivations are a mode where an individual is political for the welfare of the community of beings in general.

Under community motivations, there is another general division. It is rooted in how an individual views the innate natures/capacities of others. On the one hand, you have 'progressives/left-wingers' who believe that, under the right parenting, educational, and cultural circumstances, most everyone can be self-governing and intelligent. This view tends toward liberalism/anarchism and communism/egalitarianism. On the other hand, you have 'conservatives/right-wingers' who believe that some people are innately better fit to rule than others (genetic dispositions to intelligence, racial superiority, god's chosen people, people with the proper karma). This view tends toward authoritarianism/fascism and feudalism/capitalism. The idea being that it will be in the best interest of all beings if someone intelligent ruled over them, because they are not capable of pursuing their best interests themselves.

You've mentioned feeling yourself leaning toward fascism. Does that mean you're feeling more of a shift in your view of the capabilities of others, while still maintaining the community motivations? Or are you feeling the more fundamental shift from community to selfish motivations?

I notice myself struggling more between community or selfish motivations in general than between the two modes of community motivations.

"I agree, but we're very very picky with the games we play. So it's not true that if it's a game, we'll enjoy it or be OK with its contents."; Definitely. Some games are perceived as better than others.

"In a game where you serve a king there must be some really good reasons why you're still playing it, and those reasons are almost certainly not "because I get to serve a king." The same goes with other things we would customarily consider bad that you occasionally get to do in a game."; I agree. Most actions you take in games are extrinsic to help you accomplish your goal in the game, whatever that goal is. How is that different from real life?

To take something personal for me, we eat food to keep our bodies functioning healthily (and somewhat for gratification - a tendency I am fighting against in myself). In a game, I have no problem feeding my character animal meat to boost health or whatever, but in the 'realworld game' I have a problem feeding my character animal meat to sustain the body. Basically because I think there are real beings behind the meat in the 'realworld game' but not in the video game.

However, what if I did believe there were players behind the animals in a video game who wanted to play simpler animal-games? Would that affect my action toward those digital animals? I don't see why it would.

This gets back to the question of the degree of consciousness a being has of their own capacity to leave a game. A human gamer playing a video game as an animal would, presumably, have a much greater degree of that consciousness than a 'realworld' animal. As a result, I don't see any problem with doing things in the game that might be against the goals of other players who are free to walk away from the screen - if they serve my ends/desires and if I have no interest in a friendship/alliance with those players.

But, why would consciousness of one's capacities affect the way we treat those beings? The game may be shitty for them and it may be that if they knew they could leave then they would, but they aren't aware of that. Someone might say 'well, they're trapped here with no awareness of their capacity to escape' or 'they want to escape and they just need someone to provide them with the way to do it'. Sure, I *could* devote my self to awakening all beings in this realm, but why? Maybe if that's a life I decide to pursue in the future for a time, but not right now. That doesn't interest me or excite me too much. There are infinite realms with slumbering

beings, so it would be an unending chore. Besides, beings are all wholly responsible for their own awakening. I can't wake them up. I can only wake myself up and poke at certain beings who are in a particular place in their development to encourage them to do the internal work themselves. So, I might want some beings to be my friends, and I might treat those particular beings well, but I don't need to hold friendly relations with all beings.

If I encounter beings in life, it seems reasonable to either disregard them beyond any potential danger they pose to my own game objectives if they have nothing to offer me or to use them as means to my own ends if they do have something to offer me. Perhaps some beings will be of such a quality that I will desire to maintain a longstanding relationship with them - those beings I would treat with respect so long as their qualities seemed valuable to me, and no further - and even this is a sort of use of the other for the social qualities I desire from them. But for all the other beings, why not simply use them as resources to your own ends whenever you need, only being conscious of the dangers they might present to your game-objectives.

Arguably, this is what we already do. It's just that we habitually give other beings respect and concern ourselves with their welfare beyond our own personal interests in them. Presumably we habituated doing that because we wanted to have a fun and playful environment with other beings, or something along those lines - and then these beings gradually started to decay and we kept hoping they'd recover. But if this game, if these beings, no longer serve us, then it seems irrational to continue playing that particular game - to keep up those old habits. It seems masochistic to maintain a global community type of motivation toward beings who have no personal value to you - especially since most of those beings will gladly consume you as a resource, bodily or economically, if they get the chance.

So, I'm thinking it doesn't make sense to maintain most of my social commitments since I am not served by most of society. Eat animals and use their bodies when it's convenient to my ends. Rule over people and exploit them when it's convenient to my ends. Befriend and enjoy time with people when it's convenient to my ends. Destroy the environment when it is convenient to my ends. Murder, rape, steal, lie, assault, manipulate when it's convenient to my ends.

That's the view that's challenging my ordinary universal egalitarian communal view.

"This is important."; Is it? I explained why I'm not convinced it is in the above paragraphs. Why do you think it is important, in contrast?

"My problem isn't the capabilities, but free will."; What do you mean by free will? I was thinking about this, and in a sense other beings never really have free will. If other beings were totally 100% free, then they would be free to control your mind and experiences however they liked. You would just be an expression of their will. Beings aren't even something like 80% free, because you probably don't believe humans are free to transform themselves into 12-million headed dragons on a whim or that they are free to ice over the planet instantly and to use your body/mind like a puppet. You have placed relatively stable limitations on the options for what others are free to do. They are only free within those limitations. More and less control over others is less and more free will for them (and conversely, more and less free will for you in a sense). I think that what's important isn't 'free will' or 'no free will', but symmetry in powers v. asymmetry in powers, and what powers and for whom.

"The only time interacting with free-willed individuals is fun is when I don't depend on them in any way, when it's all purely for fun and not say for my daily bread. So I'd want my buddies or girlfriends to be

free willed."; You don't depend on your buddies or girlfriends at all? I think there's a degree of dependency even on the beings you like to kick it with. They could still hold your attachment to them over your head. Granted, there's a pretty big difference between survival dependence and social dependence. I definitely see where you're coming from.

"But I don't want an employer or a merchant or a landlord to have free will."; Haha, if we're talking about significant metaphysical alterations, I don't think I'd want to have employers, merchants, or landlords at all. I.e. if I wouldn't want the being to exist with free will, I wouldn't want it to exist as a being at all. If that's a function I'm not going to re-integrate into my mind, I'd rather replace the person with a machine that works to my interests.

"Sometimes I even think, oh the horror, fuck it, maybe I am just wiser and maybe others aren't meant to know what I know. When I think I am inherently superior, that's when it's very very easy for me to just smile when I read something I consider dumb, and not bother replying or making a comment. Then I get a sense that wisdom isn't meant to be for the other person. We're not equal and aren't meant to be equal. When I feel this way, I have zero desire to engage other people, especially if I think they're wrong or stupid."; Sure I get this. But you were once ignorant and seeking out wisdom yourself. The inherent superiority perspective is pretty fragile, as a consequence of that, in my view. Until you learned to look within for wisdom, you turned outward – and at some point you were directed inward by the outside. Others provided that for you, and you can provide that for others. Of course, you don't have to be that person for others – there will always be the potential for other wise beings to manifest in this realm and teach beings who are seeking wisdom. Don't bother doing it if you're not in the mood or it's not a game that interests you. It doesn't interest me right now, granted I still have quite a bit to figure out just intellectually. But I've had and continue to have a pretty shitty experience on Earth with these humans. I just want to leave – my bitterness and anger would need a long, long time to subside before I could even have the potential of coming to Earth with authentic compassion from a state of power. My only weakness is this young woman I've (relatively) recently met and am spending time with. She's amazing and obviously moving towards awakening in the broader scheme of things. In a way, we are a perfect match for one other, as I see it. But there are so many life factors at work on her side that it seems like nothing may happen between us which makes me deeply sad. If things work out with her (or someone like her – but I don't have high hopes. I haven't met any other women in my life so far at all like her), then I might live a life split between magick and spiritual work and enjoying Earthly delights with a woman interested in magick and spiritual work. But, if things don't work out with her, then my life will likely get extremely severe in the next several years and I expect to see myself get more frustrated and withdrawn and isolated and self-reliant. I would probably become a wandering ascetic yogi or something. Well, that got personal for me. My point was that you don't have to compare yourself with others in 'better' or 'worse' terms that leads to a sense of inferiority, superiority, or equality. That's a mindset and identity rooted in contructing social norms and moralistic values – a social/comparative identity. But maybe you've got to maintain a somewhat social identity for now? Then maybe a sense of superiority is a phase you need to go through? Where will it lead you eventually?

"So in the long term I fear I will become the elite that I loathe now."; That's something that could happen.

“I will discard symmetry and use asymmetry all over the place. And my days of fighting for the common person are probably nearing their end as well. In some ways this feels sad. In some ways I also think that common people deserve their fates, because they collectively have the power to change the whole world, and if they don't, then they deserve to live with the consequence. So fuck the common man and woman. Collectively they get what they want to get. Enough of them are greedy and property oriented to keep the whole game of capitalism afloat. Why should I help any of them? If you order a fish at a restaurant and you happen to get a fish, you can't complain. That's how I've been feeling lately and it should be obvious I can't say everything I want to say in such a short post.”; Have you ever read Max Stirner? I think you would find his ideas interesting, barring his materialism. Basically, he argues that the individual is the center of their own universe and system of values and that people become inauthentic with themselves when they convince themselves that they're living for anything other than the self (when they live for 'spooks' in his terminology – things like 'humanity', 'god', 'society', 'family', 'friendship', 'rights', 'property', etc.). Everyone is an egoist, but some people are involuntary egoists, in his view. Instead of advocating a political revolution, he supports self-realized individuals living their lives without external principles and creating a perpetual insurrection by the nature of their lives. Eventually, if people become liberated and live freely, we don't need to organize and guillotine the system – it will die naturally from sickness and internal bleeding. In fact, a political revolution isn't even a guillotine. It's more like exchanging one ruling ideological system for another. Instead of 'societies' where individuals become inauthentic and define themselves in terms of being a member of an ideology, he proposes 'unions of egoists' where the union is always consciously in the egoistic interest of each member.

I think you can have symmetry and asymmetry. If everyone is a deity from their own point of view, then that's symmetry. But from your point of view, you are god. That's asymmetry. You can do whatever you want to anyone anytime, and they are always manifesting you doing it to them. So your power is asymmetrical and symmetrical at the same time.

Yeah, he's great. His materialism is my only disagreement with him, but his analysis of the subject and of the loss of autonomy in foolish thinking is excellent. I have 'The Ego and His Own' here at home. Here are the last few lines:

> *“They say of God, "Names name thee not." That holds good of me: no concept expresses me, nothing that is designated as my essence exhausts me; they are only names. Likewise they say of God that he is perfect and has no calling to strive after perfection. That too holds good of me alone. I am owner of my might, and I am so when I know myself as unique. In the unique one the owner himself returns into his creative nothing, of which he is born. Every higher essence above me, be it God, be it man, weakens the feeling of my uniqueness, and pales only before the sun of this consciousness. If I concern myself for myself, the unique one, then my concern rests on its transitory, mortal creator, who consumes himself, and I may say: All things are nothing to me.”*]]

Reply to “The greatest possible gift.”

Lovely. Are they there to listen, though? I suppose it doesn't really matter: at worse, you are reclaiming your power from an illusion of separation from the dream. You are giving to yourself, as you say.

From experience, lots of people don't take kindly to having their... ability pointed out to them. Getting people to create synchronicity for instance (I used to use elephants, now I use owls as the example, inspired by a book) often gets a quite traumatised response. Not so much that things appear, or that reality might be dream-like. What troubles then is that it mean that *other people aren't straightforwardly real* - that the "sharing model" of the world can't be a simple one.

Now (as is the way of these things), my own expectations play back to me in this as much as anything else. Interested in how other people get along with that. You can also do it indirectly, but you are basically being sneaky to yourself if you do that, of course.

For sure (on the forcing) but these are people who ask... then receive. It's an interesting muddle.

Well, it's *mine* to allow myself the experience of them apparently having it!

Quite so.It's a funny old world. Since everything behaves *"as if"*, including time and space, apparent history and apparent persistence, how it works it can't really be explained, only asserted. I mean, it's funny trying, but it's also like chewing your own arm. (And everyone else's arm, therefore.)

Hence "Active Metaphors": the explanations you absorb shape your experience.We do quite well, on this subreddit, considering there nothing to say really, beyond things like "how you imagine it is, that's how it is" and so on.

Yes. And I guess there's lots of work to do towards being able to describe something like this, in ways that work for different audiences. There's always something new to say about something which shifts a little every time you say something about it...

It's a way of continuing to experience it freshly, I suppose. Like re-watching a favourite movie. Or reading another Philip K Dick or JG Ballard book (because they're mostly essentially the same).

Reply to “How do you solve a problem like feedback loops?”

> >All that would lead me to believe that it's in my best interests to find ways to 'collapse' the feedback loops around me - but I wonder if there's not a more direct way? Is it possible to instead reduce our dependence on feedback loops?

Hmm. Yes, I'd say. Because the feedback loop is a sign of you *resisting* learning by trying to control the process. When you learned your first language as a child, did you use a feedback loop? Was it "pretty tough"? I don't think there was a force of will involved there.

Learning and problem-solving are just what the mind *does*, naturally, as part of its "structure" - unless you are holding onto your pre-existing patterns and preventing them modifying (or only letting them be modified in a controlled, limited manner - deliberately and consciously by "you").

The urge to manage and 'be aware' of things happening is a restriction that prevents progress in any endeavour. Perhaps all that is required to become, say, a musical prodigy is to give yourself a metaphorical bang on the head.

> >In any case, we're getting away from the point, which is not language learning!

No, but it's a good example of limited change in adults compared with spontaneous, effortless development in children. And one of the reasons adults have such a hard time is because they start thinking in terms of concepts like "impetus", "model" and "feedback loops" and approach things as if their ideas of how something works is how it really works underneath.

Which is at the root of many problems people have with manifestation generally...

> >If I could 'contort my tactile sense field' in such a way to get instantaneous feedback, finding which contortions work and which do not would be drastically faster.

Why do you need the feedback? Can't you just ask for the end result and have it? Feedback is just an experience. If you are getting the experience of feedback, that's part of what you have intended...

> >But more often than not, my intentions do not manifest immediately - so maybe what I'm asking is this: how to better connect intention and manifestion?

I'd say that intention and manifestation are identical and that you are getting exactly what you are asking for. Manifestation is always instantaneous!

If I intend something to happen next month, it is *true right now that it happens next month*. The manifestation occurs immediately from the perspective of the timeless landscape of the world. Following the intention, your ongoing present moment then has the experiences as they are laid out. So if you intend something and you go through a cycle of feedback before you get the final result, maybe that's because you intended that whole process - by implication, through your expectation about how the world works. The structure of your mind dictated the pattern that your manifestation would take.

To get more "direct" then, perhaps one must dispense with any notions of "the mechanism".

TL;DR: **You need to intend to "skip to the end!"**

Reply to “What is time?”

[[Utthana (OP): What is time?

Take a minute to repeat that question to yourself a few times. Slowly, ideally, so you can take a step beyond contemplating it intellectually and actually start investigating the reality you're experiencing presently. What *is* time? *How long* is the present moment?

Stop reading, turn your head away from the screen, and actually spent a minute or two on that. I'll wait.

So it's a fairly unconventional thing to think about, and this is made obvious by how difficult it is to really contemplating the question using word-thoughts.

For me, the most basic way that I tend to think of time is as the perceived non-simultaneous, non-instantaneous quality of experience. Everything doesn't appear to be happening all at once in a single moment. Things seem "spaced". Well, that leads us to some questions: in *what sense* are all things not simultaneous and instantaneous? What do I *mean* that everything isn't happening all at once?

Well, it seems that I can remember things that *have* happened that are not currently happening, and I can imagine things that *could be* happening which aren't. But neither the past nor the hypothetical present or future have any genuine existence in what I'm actually presently experiencing, and so there would seem to be a sense in which I cannot really say that anything *has already been* or *could be* happening which is not presently happening. This is a fairly familiar concept to most, I assume. The past and future "borrow" their reality from the present.

So, since describing time as the quality of experience by which things aren't all happening at once, we're left without a satisfactory explanation for what time really is. Is time an illusion entirely? Well it certainly *seems* that things have happened "before" now -- it doesn't *feel* as though each moment, reality is essentially recreated as near-identical to before. But even thinking in this way presupposes the existence of time. It is difficult to think in ways which exclude a temporal aspect entirely.

If time is "real", we can ask ourselves how it came about. It doesn't make much sense to think of time as having had a beginning, because a beginning implies temporal causality (i.e. one thing provoking another by virtue of having happened before it so as to bring about a change). We could imagine a Self, or Brahman, or God, entirely outside of time, or experiencing a very "different kind" of time, in which causality is no longer a relevant factor. This is a bit like if humans experiences a film frame by frame, they might perceive one frame as -causing- the next, but from the vantage point of the True Self or God, all of the frames would be laid out and perceived "at once". But then, why should we perceive time in the causal way that we do?

What's perhaps interesting to contemplate, here, is that the linear, causal way of thinking about time is a relatively new one. Judeo-Christian ways of thinking, in particular, made the linear and causal way of thinking about time the cultural default, as you can learn about in detail elsewhere, because it is a way of approaching time that makes Original Sin and the Death of Christ genuinely applicable. Judaism and Christianity have uniquely emphasized the historical and conventional facts and their

causal relationship with practitioners. Punishment and accountability only work in linear, causal time. Before this influence, however, the most common way of thinking about time was as *cyclical.*

Cyclical time is often thought of in the sense of Mayan calendar cycles, but this would be like thinking of linear time as the Gregorian calendar. Focus instead of the subtle quality of experience that cyclical time lends itself to, like the quality of experience that linear time lends itself to (i.e. strict causality, a determined and unchangable past and an unknowable future which cannot influence the present).

The quality of cyclical time is far more interesting than the linear, causal, conventional way. In cyclical time, causality is very different. Where on a number line 1 leads to 2, which leads to 3, on a *circle,* 1 can be said to lead to 3, but *3 can just as equally be said to have laid to 1.* Thinking about this inverse in causality for a while is worthwhile. Whereas in linear time, the future is some empty, unknowable, non-existent void, in cyclical time it is granted a relationship with the present that is on par with that of the past. Events in your memory have "caused" the reality you're experiencing presently, but in a very real way, things that you conceive of as having "not yet occurred" have just as much influence on where you exist right now (though if you've got a mental image of the circle, the distance is obviously much greater between 3 and back to 1 again, ergo the less obvious connection in conventional ways of thinking). In cyclical time, the present moment is the re-actualization of something which has happened "before" and will happen "again" -- only the past, present, and future have all had an equal influence on one another because the concept of before-then-after causality doesn't apply here.

I find this a hugely interesting thing to think about. Maybe a few of you will read this and, seeing it fresher than I can, it will inspire further thoughts on the subject that I'm able to conjure. I'd love to hear them.]]

Good stuff. Something that fascinates me is the way we represent time in our minds metaphorically, and how that influences our approach to it. We literally experience time as represented in our perceptual/thinking space!

This is different across different cultures too:

- Western people tend to imagine time as running left to right on a "timeline", literally in front of them. Past is to the left, present is directly in front, future is off to the right.

  All time is visible and the causal nature of past->present->future is implied.

- Some other cultures have time running back-to-front (so to speak). The past is behind your head, out of sight. The present is directly in front of you. The future continues onwards into the distance.

  Here, the past cannot be seen and the future is obscured by the present moment.

  Causality isn't clear - only the notion that you must get past the present in order to access the next moment in the "future".

- Just reminded that my Dad used to imagine time as a sort of simmering bubble floating off to one side. All events were sort of "dissolved" into this. It was an ongoing present containing all moments in time.

Think of how dramatically our approach to living can be altered by which visualisation we adopt.

[...]

> >In fact to cognize a cup's location on the table I must have some sense of where else it could have been but isn't.

In fact, one of the basic errors people make - once they think beyond just things being "objects" - is to assume that a cup is just that visual image plus touch sensations. Actually, what we experience is an entire *cup-ness* which is entangled with its context.

What I mean: So, cup-ness would be all previous experiences with cups, everything you have heard about cups, combined with everything you know about the current place where the cup is - all folded into a single *knowledge-feeling*.

Reply to “Controlling feeling vs controlling material form”

> >The idea I have is that the feeling is what is generating the vision and other forms.

It can certainly *lead* the other forms, and if you don't have the associated feeling of a form (what you might call the "feeling of fact" since it doesn't have to be emotional as such) then you haven't completely created it.

Following on the *Patterns* post ideas, if you summon a particular feeling then you trigger the patterns associated with that feeling. And certainly if you behave "as if" something then that does the same thing: you are creating direct sensation which bring about the related experiences. Basically, directed dreaming.

In the end, this comes down to the usual: assert new "facts", in any way you feel inclined, and the world will being to behave as though those "facts" were true:

e.g. When imagining things, messing around with the sensory aspects directly is very inefficient and actually inhibits progress. Instead, imagining *that* something is true, the imagery follows automatically (provided you don't block it). This is equally true of world manifestations as mind manifestations - because they are the same thing!

If you go about the place with the constant feeling of "it's it great!" then the world falls in line with that in a general way. In fact, one of Goddard's recommendations I think is that if you can't visualise well, you can simply say "it's so wonderful! thankyou so much!" and that will generate the appropriate feeling - which in turn will produce the results because it inherently "assumes the wish is fulfilled".

If you can't get at it directly, you approach it by accepting something that *implies* that it is true.

Bad example but: You don't believe a door can be opened. Can't get the feeling. So instead, you approach by asserting someone being inside the room, which implies the door must be openable, hence you allow yourself to have the door openable. You *lead in* to plausibility.

> >We can get away with simply feeling how we would expect to feel during these experiences and then being detached from any expectation of what happens

I dare you to do that without actually triggering the larger pattern and essentially "asserting a fact" after all! ;-) Really they are all versions of the same thing, right?

Asserting facts is basically pattern-triggering. You can't assert something you can't conceive of, so the pattern must already exist in some sense. If it exists in some sense, then it is like a memory pattern.

So really - everything I've said is the same thing from different angles. Sometimes I chunk it up into "moments", sometimes into "patterns", sometimes "facts". The underlying is of course undivided - but we need to select an entry point in order to conceptualise an intention and make a choice.

Going about your day, just maintaining a feel of expansive space, and the feeling that goes with how you want your life to be, is alone a good idea. And ties in with...

So if the context of that was "I want to imagine a spaceship in front of me" (as in: visualising stuff in your mind), then trying to "draw" the object in the air isn't a great way to do it. Just as in daily life, sensory imagery arises from fact. Assumption implies creation. So an alternative is to "decide' that the

visual object is there, make it's presence a fact, and have the imagery arise naturally that. It's similar to the "trigger the pattern by the feeling" thing.

That's what happens anyway once you get good at picturing stuff: You let "the unconscious mind" do the work for you. This is a way of short-cutting it.

It's just a suggestion. I found it helpful. See if it's useful for you.

It'll just "come". You have to let it happen. It's a bit like the "let the world come to you" thing for the senses, rather than trying to see with "eyes" and hear with "ears". Play around with it. It only really makes sense if it happens.

Sit back, and decide that a large model of the Millennium Falcon is floating a couple of metres in front of you. Let it appear in its own time.

[...]

My interpretation of Mr Goddard is that, having recognised that the world is made of imagination and operates on an "as if" basis, he understood that we simply need to re-imagine it. *The Law and the Promise* is a little clearer on this I think.

Changes thus instigated could potentially manifest (persist sensorily in awareness) instantly, however the intensity of the imagery we have created thus far tends to result in an apparent time element - i.e. it's easier to create changes that are "out of sight" sensorily and in terms of current event momentum, than it is to "condense" a new environment while we are looking at that implied time-space place.

Reply to “The Mirror-like Nature of the Mind & Why I've come to the conclusion that Oneirosophy isn't a good strategy”

> >The basic strategy of some on this sub seems to be "well if I believe in my own power enough, then my unconventional perceptions are true"

Hopefully not, but perhaps you are right. However that's like thinking you can simply will things to happen or by "doing" things. But it's not quite like that. And more like you say.

Like I said in an earlier post, it's more like *triggering patterns* (or "letting experiences through") which then arise in and shape subsequent experience:

- Experiences leave traces which *in-form* subsequent experiences. (Leave shapes on your "experiential filter".)
- Thoughts also leave traces, as *in-form-ation*, affecting subsequent experiences. (You can use this deliberately.)
- Synchronicity is the name for the experiential patterns which result.

This is the reason you should treat the subjective environment (as it were) as being almost mechanical and unintelligent in nature. Only *you* are the intelligence. You are basically you experiencing the state of your own mind, via the senses.

Yes, you might think of it a bit like a mirror - or better, that your mind is a perceptual filter. So, not much good for "messages" since you'll just be seeing what you've been thinking and experiencing, as residual indentations on your filter - except that you might get some insight into things you are thinking in the background that you're not aware of.

If you spend 20 minutes today imagining owls, as vividly as you can, as if they were in the room with you... you'll spend the next week encountering lots of owls. It's as if you have created an "owl-shaped hole" in your perceptual filter, and the "infinite light of creation" (or whatever) now shines through it, giving you owl-shaped experiences.

If you believed in a deeper meaning to what you were experiencing, you might think you were getting Messages From The Eternal Owls, who were answering your questions and prayers now that you had gained power over them. If you spent time imagining being King Of The Monkeys instead, you might get experiences which you would interpret in line with that.

This itself is incredibly useful - and you can live exciting storylines! - but you have to be careful not to *believe* the thoughts and experiences which appear in your awareness. They have no deeper meaning that *being-experiences*. Which is great, because you can now understand what happens when you get paranoid, and what happens when you get arrogant. You can put that aside, breathe, and let things settle out into a more authentic pattern.

Never *believe* what you are experiencing. They are just... experiences.

Surely this is exactly what Oneirosophy leads to? It's the natural conclusion to living life *as* a subjective environment? It's what lucidity reveals to you. Subjective idealism means there is no you, just that environment, and it makes sense then that it operates and responds as a swirling, responsive dream-space.

> >It's not even "as if" you've created an owl-shaped hole.

I say "as if" because the metaphor of the filter and the hole is that, a metaphor. Saying "as if" doesn't mean the experience is less valid, it just indicates the description of it is arbitrary. You are not *really* making dents in a filter; that's just a way of looking at it for the purposes of formulating intentions.

> >I guess I don't entirely understand OP's distinction between "being-experiences" and "believing in" them.

As I understand it - and this may be me overlaying my own interpretation - OP's underlying point is that if you are unaware of the reflection-like, "as if"-ness mechanism involved in subjective idealism, then you can fall under the impression that you have *become* something, created some*thing*, or are in some sort of state. However, it really is just an appearance. There is nothing "behind" your experiences, therefore nothing to believe you are and nothing to believe you have done.

This is of course much more powerful than believing you are God or anything else. Believing you *are* something comes with restrictions; recognising it's an "as if" experience doesn't. Language, for sure, but forums throughout reddit are swamped with people wondering what they "are", claiming to be this and that, and generally taking sensory experience and history recall as causal fact.

> >You can't live exciting storylines without believing your perceptions. Otherwise it's just some superficial fantasy.

I'm not sure I quite agree on the latter sentence. I'd say that if you understand the process then you aren't having a superficial fantasy; you are simply *enjoying experiences*. But your point of identifying with a psychological narrative - be it "infinite power" or anything else - is well made.

So, the Owl Generation Process is completely mechanical. "Ponder them and they will come." The exception is if you obstruct the process by *dis*belief. Which you might then be tempted to overcome with *belief* - and that's where things go wrong. You can get caught up the the believing process you (think) you used to generate the effect. If you recognise the process for what it is though, you can enjoy the Owl Experiences and without any additional troublesome beliefs. It's up to you if you want to fully commit to "An Important Mission Personally Given To Your By The High Owl Commander". (Personally I wouldn't - he's a right grumpy bastard.)

> >You can't actually be angry and see the empty nature of your perception at the same time.

If you aren't "in" the story then you can't really be having the adventure. Although I think you can dip in and out, personally. All I'd argue for is that people understand the nature of the process, and thereby have the ability to make choices. You don't have to use belief as a tool (as in with many magickal approaches) and then get stuck in it, if you've observed the mechanical-like nature of the process and approach things from that perspective.

> >Personally, I dont try to stay fixed in one worldview, so I dont have a problem with these inconsistencies.

Hi, I make the point elsewhere that there are no true divisions, it's a matter of where you "stand". What you say is true. An analogy I sometimes use is the superposition of patterns: combine 100 patterns together and you've still got... a pattern. Which can then be broken down into a completely different set of patterns. Depending on what you want to accomplish or which aspects you want to highlight, you might emphasise the perspective of one "component" or another. But really, there is no separation.

For basic "daily navigation" and accounting for deliberate synchronicity, this formulation (filtering infinity) is quite convenient. But it is nothing more than an "active metaphor".

Implicit in all discussions here is "it's nondual", I'd say, but there's nothing else to say if we just sit there with that! It's like saying "all is consciousness". As you point out, there is no answer.

"There are no answers, only choices", as Gibarian says in *Solaris*.

[...]

> >Authenticity is more important than propriety for someone heading towards awakening, which is why they can seem offensive to someone who believes in etiquette.

Yeah, but I'm not sure being relentlessly dickish is *necessarily* part of the package. :-)

To be fair to /u/guise_of_existence, he made a good point that didn't get responded to:

> >The fact that the voice in your head says you're omniscient and impervious to puny human trivialities doesn't make it so.

Which calls to his original idea, which everyone seems to have either missed, misunderstood or ignored. It's pretty easy to (unintentionally) create synchronistic experiences that say "you are God". Every conspiracy theorist accidentally creates experiences of that type for instance (people really do look round at them; their mail looks like it's been opened; but it isn't deeper than that). So the "danger" he was referring to is that you might get confirmation of a view, *without actually having developed actual 'Godlike Powers'*. There's also the whole thing of talking a good game about how we'd like things to be, without actually having got there to find out if it *can* be.

It's fair enough that /u/guise_of_existence doesn't have the same dedicated enthusiasm/optimism as some. Why should he, if his experience and experimentation hasn't shown it to be the case yet?

> >If a person is having experiences that suggest they are god and they believe they are god - if they are dreaming they are god - are they not actually god?

The valid point for me is that you can have the "universe" reflect back to you that you are Godlike, without being Godlike. It's the danger of *half*-intending without realising it. It's the problem of receiving and believing "messages" via synchronicity and thinking they have backing beyond simply being your thought-patterns hanging about.

We might think of that as a "danger" of this approach that people should be aware of. I suppose it's similar to the problems some people have when they first get into the occult for generally. Anything beyond that interpretation, strays into "my evidence is not evidence" territory, for sure.

> >Everyone knows that a person can become a schizophrenic and that it's something to be avoided.

Hmm. What *is* schizophrenia in this worldview, would you say?

My working theory connects to what I say above: That someone is stuck in a experiential feedback loop based on what they *think about* themselves, rather than having intended actual changes. They are trying to interpret the universe as a responsive, message-giving thing, rather than something that's simply matching (or *being*) their state. It's basically: not having gone deep enough.

Reply to “PSA: Be careful when thinking about "I"”

Yes, it's a language trickiness. It's sort of awkward to constantly distinguish between "Is" and "selfs", but unless you flag up the difference it is easy for a reader to become confused, thinking you are talking about a *person* being "God".

There is no ego-self other than the experiencing of various thoughts, perceptions, actions and the subsequent *thinking-about* them. And the experiencer is "the open aware space" - which you might call God - who takes on the shape of experiences.

As always, when we start *thinking-about* things we are immediately wrong and operating in 3rd-person metaphor (although of course that can be very useful). The difference between "i" and "I" is direct 1st-person (no-"person") experiencing.

> >I didn't know that what I needed to do was not think and just let things be.

Yeah, that's a big hurdle. I used to use the phrase "stop generating" to describe it (Although at first I would just think it a lot or try to do "stopping", which rather missed the point of my insight, eh.)

Realising that your default should be "allowing" with only occasional pattern creation-amendment is an important step.

> >What do you do now if things start getting out of hand?

If you haven't read the *Overwriting Yourself* post, check it out. The 'passive' version of the exercise is a nice easy way of letting things settle. Following that, decide not to 'force' anything, including your bodily movements and thoughts. Try and let them "arise by themselves". This stops things building up; lets them subside naturally.

> >What do you mean by pattern creation-ammendment?

Just setting something going by decision and imagination. Once you've set things in motion, you should leave them be (e.g. you request success in an endeavour, the pattern is now set, so don't tinker with it). You're only dealing in updates as required, or a regular keeping-on-track.

> >Otherwise I'm horribly depressed.

Yeah. I do find that if I don't stay 'present' - allow my focus to remain expanded out into the space of experience - my attention gets narrowed and I feel depression. Having things 'on the go' does tend to keep you opened out more.

It changes your perspective to being far simpler. The most important thing is that it clarifies the difference between *direct-experiencing* and *thinking-about*, and you can more obviously take the perspective of the space in which both occur.

[...]

The mistake in contemplation is that you *can't* contemplate the "I". It is the environment in which contemplation arises; it can't be conceptualised or even pointed to.

The urge is so great to "grab ahold of it" somehow. It's probably something that never entirely goes away, because it's inevitable to want to think and talk about it - in subreddits just like this...

I think it would be useful at some point to do some coverage about *direct-experiencing* and the difference between that and *thinking-about*. Various metaphors imply it, but I don't think we've explored it explicitly in any post. Which is unfortunate, since *detached-allowing* and knowing the difference between the two types of experiencing (really the one type, improperly understood) is fundamental.

[...]

Kinda right: Your ego is just an imaginary thing - a pattern of thoughts, given a name. It's nothing special. Just let it be. You shouldn't take *any* thought or experience seriously, as being "true".

Interesting to ponder: Why does the voice in your head have the same tonal qualities as your spoken voice? Your mind has no vocal cords, after all. So why do people tend to identify with that voice as being "them"?

Reply to “Sensory Reversal”

[[Utthana: This evening I imagined, "If the physical world is an illusion, how can I come to access the world beyond illusion? Senses are all no-go's. What else do I have to work with?" And I thought, oddly enough, of senselessness. So I closed my eyes very, very slowly. I watched as my vision, which seemed to take up the entire potential visible field, began to develop definite 'edges' The top and bottom of my visual field started to disappear into the lightlessness of closed eyes. And soon what remained of my vision was just a tiny, trembling flicker surrounded almost entirely by lightlessness until my eyes finally closed entirely. And I'd do this again and again, very slowly opening them back up, and very slowly re-closing them.

I started imagining an image of myself with two tiny, round TV screens floating in front of my eyeballs like the lenses of eyeglasses. And each of them was showing me a very slightly different perspective on the world in the same way that 3D glasses do to present a 3D movie. And the interesting part really began when, as I slowly closed my eyes, I would imagine the screens compressing horizontally until they dissolved away, and as I slowly opened my eyes, the screens would emerge again and slowly expand. And I held this visual in my mind very strongly and probably spent no less than 15 minutes imagining that, as I felt my physical eyes close, the 3D screens were dissolving. I recommend you do this and pay special note to what you begin to 'see' when your eyes are closed.

The sensation settled in that as I closed my eyes, I was effectively opening my actual visual field to the "genuine" world -- and naturally when I felt like I was opening my eyes, I was actually covering up the real universe with a virtual screen. What are the implications of this approach?

Well, it implies that the emptiness you see when you close your eyes is kind of "more real" than what you see when your eyes are open. This means that total sensory deprivation, including thoughts, would be the effective extinguishing of the physical world -- and also, therefore, might share similarities with the state of mind of an enlightened being. This may be intuitive, **but what's (I think) profound to imagine is that what's left, the dark, scentless, tasteless, sensationless, thoughtless world you'd experience in total sensory deprivation, is precisely the state you return to in deep sleep, certain states of meditation, or death. When you close your eyes, you're looking at the "Real World" beyond illusion. The only illusion would be to imagine that you're seeing the backs of eyelids.** I found this to be very powerful to experiment with.

It also confirms strangely well with the scientific approach to the world which should make this practice a fairly accessible one for even skeptic-minded folks. Everything we experience, according to physics, comes at us as wavelengths of some sort. All of matter, all of our sensory experiences, all of existence, boils down to wavelengths. It's therefore, potentially, fairly easy for even the uninitiated to imagine their whole perceived reality as merely the massively complex wavelengths projected by a hyper-advanced 3D screen. Of course, it's hardly intuitive to imagine pains, scents, and visions as being projections of wavelengths, but it's approachable and comprehensible, I think, to a broad audience.

Another very interesting thing that can be done with this practice is to, while sitting in a dim-to-dark environment, perceiving all of the dark spots in your field of vision (shadows, black objects, etc.) as

> 'holes' in the screen. The nature of the visual field suddenly becomes very thin, 2D, and almost transparent. Thoughts?]]

That's a fun approach. Like realising you've been wearing VR goggles all along. |8|-)

The Imagination Room metaphor was an attempt at something similar: to give you a way of looking at things which you can take around with you, seeing the sensory world as a floating mirage in the undefined space of...

The better version would be a "holographic space", but having the projection come from the "floor" is something that can be used to keep you, ahem, *grounded* during daily life.

An H.S. is kinda what you're approaching here?

> >Everything we experience, according to physics, comes at us as wavelengths of some sort.

I'd say you can ditch the "wavelengths" part, because one of the steps everyone has to take eventually that scientific experiments are just part of the sensory dream, as it were. And in any case it appeals to a more scientific crowd. "Observing wavelengths" is a story we experience that is made up of *sensations and perceptions*, so -

Instead, you can simply point out that sensations (images are harder, but sounds, bodily sensations, thoughts, emotional feelings) are all "findable" floating in your own awareness. You can literally sit someone down and take them through this, directing their attention at the different parts of experience, and they'll "get it".

> >What are the implications of this approach?

Vision is always the trickiest though, because it *seems* so obvious that "spatial extension" is a real thing outside, when it isn't. Your idea of imagining it as 'TV screens' you can push away is a good way to have people "stand back in their heads" a bit at the very least, maybe even actually learn that the visual content can be directly manipulated...

> >But what I'm really implying is something that goes beyond screens into a full sensory hologram.

Right! I do think it's easier to introduce the simpler version first - the "floor" in my room, the "screen" in your description. Because: When we switch to talking about a holographic space, we're saying something a bit more: that the whole of the world is dissolved (non-spatially, non-temporally) into the background awareness, and that your 3D sensory experience is just what you are currently "selecting" with your attention. And by "the world" here, we really mean the patterns that we've accumulated within ourselves, as that space.

> >"You can literally sit someone down and take them through this"... I like that.

I'm always on the lookout for ways to communicate this. Another fun thing to try with people - which has worked pretty well - is the little exercise described in the post *Outside: The Dreaming Game*. It draws people's attention to the background space that they are.

A variation on that is the "where is your real hand?" exercise, where you get people to try to point to their "real hand" (having explained that, even under the standard description, what they are experiencing right now is at

best a "mind representation" of the world). If they point to their head (to indicate their brain), you ask them where their "real head" is...

The best approach, I think, remains simply lying down and giving up completely and absolutely. Vitally, this includes releasing your attentional focus to let it move as it wants - *this is the real key.*

Given some time without being stirred by intention, the "space" settles out and naturally reveals itself to be open and unbounded. *Looking* for this interrupts it by deforming the space via attention; *thinking-about* this obscures it with the shadow-senses that constitute thought. This is why the whole "seeking" thing has to be dropped in order to be "enlightened", I suggest.

[...]

> >reading this post I pictured my vision as a 3d bubble in a 4 dimensional void, powerful stuff. But I would be somewhat cautious to labeling said void as "the real reality".

That's how I envisage the *Infinite Grid* thing. My current sensory experience is my *3D attention* scanning over a *4D environment*.

It's *always* the the 'real reality', right? Just taking on different forms. Even 'void' is an experience of some sort.

Reply to “Mechanics of Manifestation from the No-Self Perspective”

Can I pick up on a couple of things?

What do we mean by "want"? Our man obviously never really wanted to be paralysed in an "ego" sense. Ask him, he'd say "no thanks, operational legs are cool!"

So, what is the nature of this wanting? Do we not just mean the direction of the flow of life, if it were unobstructed? Obstructing a path leads to "alternative methods". For instance, perhaps he didn't want to be a performer anymore, however he resisted the opportunities that presented themselves, and so it came to extremes. He didn't want to be paralysed as such; he wanted the eventual outcome and temporary paralysis was the path that resulted.

Meanwhile, on will and possibility. Why do you find it difficult to accept, say, putting your hand through a wall? Have you had any progress in getting yourself to expand out your presence, overwrite your boundary yet - or do you still find that exposure/fear response getting in the way?

Hey, wait a minute... what's this?

> because the manifest appearance is in some sense a shadow of the past wants

I'd go with this. There's always traces. The "past" is a tricky word though, because of the presence of all time as contributor, but we can ignore that mostly.

> There are times when being content is the wrong attitude.

I don't read it as "being content", as in wanting to stay in your current state forever. It's sort of the opposite. That *were you to remove all obstructions* then what you want would come to pass. Because you obstruct, then you end up with things you don't really want, temporarily, as a means of forcing you towards what you want.

I guess it ties into your idea of "being ready to pay the penalty". You are *always* on the way to getting what you desire (I think), but if you obstruct the path to that, you'll get nasty side-effects as your world tries to force its way to that configuration, by working around your "held patterns".

>Nah, it's not that shallow.

Yeah, just a plausible description to illustrate my point, you get the idea though. That he might have accidentally created his paralysis situation, because he wasn't *consciously* managing himself / his world.

>I know why but I don't want to talk about it now.

Nah, not about the why - was just wondering if you'd made progress, since I was writing up something on it (overwriting yourself, deleting boundaries) and if you'd had something to report, it might have been interesting to me.

>I have a very active contemplation life. My experience changes slowly. I can experience this or that peak experience, but that's not what I regard as change. Those peak experiences are like temporary blips. Change is slow, gradual and lasting.

A good point about peak experiences. People go seeking for these, but I think that - apart from perhaps knocking someone out of their complacency and showing there's something more going on - they can be a distraction from real change.

I think they are a distraction if they become a pursuit. Interesting about the Buddhist perspective you describe.

>It's critical, whether you avoid meditative absorptions or not, to not have fear and revulsion toward them.

I think they can be enjoyed for what they are. To meditate in order to seek enlightenment, say, is folly. To do it because it's enjoyable, or to gain an experience, that's fine, or a flash of insight, whatever.

Peak experiences, by their nature, are "peak" and so you don't learn how to rest in that state in general, if that is your aim. So people who dedicate themselves entirely to peak-seeking can be missing out, setting themselves up for 20 years of retrospective disappointment, when they could be more direct and start having it now.

>What do you think a 3 year dark retreat is, for example?

I think it's a process of *relaxation*.

Maybe the problem here is the word "peak". By definition, peak experiences are transitory, but can offer temporary insight. This is what some people get from meditation (mantra until thoughts cease and they can see the background; one-pointed until exhaustion and attention opens out). For the general state, perhaps we can say "optimum" or "highest" or "expansive" or "relaxed as awareness" - or whatever. Something that doesn't seem to involve force.

Obviously I don't mean relaxation as in chilling out - it's in the proper sense, of releasing into a more optimum, sustainable state. Of course, consciously pursuing a state can establish new patterns. Or more importantly: delete them!

The word "temporary" is probably clearer, then. But we know what we mean.

Yeah, I just think that "relaxing into the valley" is more what it feels like, in terms of effort. But equally if you approach it energetically to write the plateau, you'll find the valley and the plateau are in fact the same place.

Either/or. What's important is that the final state doesn't require maintenance or energy - it is stable and effortless.

People have wasted their whole lives meditating intensely to recapture that "calm, oneness" moment they had years ago, confusing the experience with enlightenment. But enlightenment isn't an experience, it's a state. You can't maintain an experience. And a forced experience can't be turned into a state.

That doesn't poo-poo peak experiences - they can be a source if great insight and wisdom. But so can Reddit sometimes. You don't want to try to spend your whole life there though, in the hope of eventually reaching some experience of non-stop insight. ;-)

Clarifying then: Insight is an event, enlightenment (or being awake, or whatever) is a state. One might inspire you to the other, but should not be confused with the other.

Sorry, the *method* by which you gain one (insight, an experience) should not be assumed to be a method by which you can gain the other (a stable state).

> >Of course relaxing only 5 minutes at a time is an excruciatingly slow way to lower your base level of tension. That's true. And if your relaxation times are also attended by bad conceptual schemes, then your relaxation can even have a counter effect of making you more tense at a base level.

And if what you do between-times is counter, then you are a see-saw.

So, the state (this particular one) is something you eventually want to have during daily life. A method that peaks can lead you there, perhaps gradually shift you - but what's important us that the effect persists in some way, when you are not doing the method. It's about changing your patterns. Your default state (relaxed state?) is what you want to modify and retain. That is the measure of your progress, yes?

Sure. A "distraction" doesn't mean "detrimental" of course - the warning is not that one is to avoid an experience, but to beware of confusing it for something else, for the goal and the method. Enjoy 'em, and be encouraged by them, and get 'em when you like - but remember they aren't necessarily "progress".

You make a good point about being wary can cause problems; it can lead it a type of resistance which can really block change. Like trying to do things "right" can be a massive barrier to change.

Yeah, incomplete sentence/thought: not detrimental to one's path per se. It just doesn't progress it *if you keep chasing those experiences instead of continuing on the path*.

It's about taking the experience, but staying on target. Because if an experience is *content*, then obsessing over it moves you away from the background - the opposite direction from expansiveness.

Chasing a pattern is like opening a door in a dream: there's usually a landscape for you to investigate beyond it. Look at a pattern and it'll become more and more detailed, just-in-time to give you more to explore. Forever. But you are not in fact making progress; you are creating, not realising.

> >And never trying to do the right things is also a massive barrier. :) Isn't that funny?

Haha, good :-)

> So either you chase those experiences or you continue on the path? That's the dichotomy?

Oh, you are being *picky*. The sentence doesn't even say that. I said **if** you keep chasing those experiences **instead of** continuing on the path. In the sense that, once you discover that alcohol doesn't make you better at passing your exams, doesn't mean you have to quit drinking. You just don't drink as a study-aid.

> >What's wrong with adding a little qualification to what you said, you know, the thing in bold?

Uh-huh, it was obvious. As my bolding above demonstrates! You feeling hungover or something? Seem more irritable than usual today. ;-)

(Happy New Year, by the way, hope 2015 is a good one for you.)

> >What if you just realized you can create?

You are never not creating, so I let's replace "can create" with "*are creating*". It's the "highest siddhi" as they say. Once you realise, you should probably *stop* for a bit, take a breath.

And then, instead of accidentally creating by implication, scatter gun style - i.e. constantly looking at patterns and, gosh, there's even more detail there - decide to do it consciously, with your new-found understanding. Or not even. :-)

You know what I mean: The method by which (most) peak experiences are achieved is not the method by which ongoing realisation can be maintained.

> >"Stopping" is no different from anything else. Stopping is still a temporal mental fabrication. Still creating.

That's not what I mean. It's something more like "ceasing interfering". You let what you have created keep rolling on its own momentum (this is of course your own creation, but you are no longer tweaking it). As in, you stop adjusting the patterns.

> >We're talking about realization. You know, when the person wakes up to the fact that their nature is creative and always has been thus?

So, exactly what I said.

> >That's something I agree with. I just don't share your attitude toward peak experiences. Which is funny, because I don't even experience that many of them lately, and yet I know should I develop your style of aversion/dismissiveness toward them, I'll just hamstring myself later on.

I think you're reading into what I'm saying incorrectly. It's not an *aversion* to peak experiences, it's the confusing of peak experiences with *achievement* on your path. Have 'em, enjoy 'em, if you get insights then use 'em - but don't go *looking* for them (except for fun).

I think we are talking past each other, because these terms encapsulate a lot of different things, and we're not giving examples.

That's just wording.

It comes down to a difference we have: You see (as I recall) that creation and experience and intending and deciding are *constant ongoing things* - constantly *active*. Whereas I see it as patterns and momentum, unfolding deterministically (if not predictably) until redirected by intention (i.e. patterns and path are reshaped).

In your view, there could be no "letting go" or relaxation.

> >I definitely cannot accept your view, at least not literally.

Perhaps we can take a different tac. Do you beat your heart, or does it beat itself as an ongoing unfolding pattern that has arisen and will fall? In what sense do you "do" your heart-beating? It doesn't seem that you have to maintain it moment by moment; it just happens. However, at any point we could choose to act in a way that stopped that heart. (Although I'd miss ya.)

Is it perhaps you think that, if things are not actively maintained, they will relax immediately into non-existence? This isn't how things work though, from investigation. The more complex the pattern, the more self-supporting it is, the more persistent and the greater the inertia.

That's why "letting go" doesn't immediately return you to open space.

> >There is no relaxation or tension because both relaxation and tensions turn out to be mental fabrications.

Could you talk a bit more about what you mean by "mental fabrications"? I'm not sure what you mean. Where would these fabrications be? Or do you just means that they are structures just like every other structure or pattern in consciousness?

We're muddling things here.

Ultimately, there is no-thing and that is you. That is understood. Any patterns which appear within that, are just what they are: patterns in/of awareness. To call them "fabrications" is redundant, they are patterns of experience, that's that - although within the context of other patterns they also have additional relative meaning. To return to volition, there is no causality between one pattern and another, so there is no need for maintenance. Your "consent" is neither here nor there, because you don't have the power to consent as a person. If you "train yourself" to alter your heart rate, you're really just asserting against the pattern. You are not "doing" anything. It is a fact that patterns given momentum - within the context of the pattern of time and space - will continue until interrupted or compromised. (A sand castle pattern will stand indefinitely, except for the overlapping of patterns called "wind" and "tide".)

You are still talking about "someone's mind" and "my heart", I note. I assume you are talking from the personal perspective there, rather than standing as the background.

"Overlaid": There actually is a bit more to it. There are granularities of structure, but overall there is no solid underlying substrate because there are no permanent things at all, quite right.

> >I am not muddling anything.

I mean, *you and I* are muddling, talking at slightly different angles.

> >Subjective idealism can lean toward realism or anti-realism.

I don't see how, if it is subjective idealism. The book with the whirlpools isn't subjective idealism; it's idealism. Hence it can posit an extended world made of awareness of which "little you" are one folded, spatial section (in the metaphor, anyway), of a "mind at large". Everything is in mind, of mind. Subjective idealism says it's *your* mind. Of course, the two blend into one after investigation, depending on perspective and dis-identification.

> >There is no background. If you think there is a background, then again, you're objectifying an aspect of your being.

The background *is* you and is completely non-object-based - but simultaneously it is of course the foreground. Formlessness/form, all that.

On Angles, Minds, Backgrounds

> >If you talked at a precisely the same angle as me, you'd be me, right?

I was really using the word "angle" casually, but this is nice. We are all at different angles to the world, and to each other. If two such perspective were to have an identical angle, their experience would be identical in all respects.

> >Kant believed that even though all we can know is the mind, nonetheless the mind was orchestrated somehow or influenced by things beyond it. So Kant's idealism admits a whiff of objectivity into it.

A whiff of objectivity, from the perspective of the "small mind", in that it suggests that not everything is contained within your experience, right now. I believe *everything* is included in this room, right now, as it were. Colloquially speaking of course; the room itself is not an actual environment.

> >But when we say it's your mind, we don't mean it's George's mind. We mean it in a very abstract sense. Just enough to affirm responsibility and to avoid objectifying experience, but no more than that.

Is there a better way we can phrase this? To me, there's no such thing as "George's mind" - there is an idea that occasionally appears called "George" which is quite heavily structured; other ideas and thoughts, even actions, occasionally arise which are consistent with the limits of that "George" idea. But there's no way in which I *am* "George", except that those ideas and thoughts are appearing in and of me.

> >Then it can't be called "background" since it isn't to the back of you, or in fact, to the back of anything. It's like remember how you chided me for talking about levels, saying there are no levels?

Yes, it's not "background" in the sense of levels. It's not like having a canvas and then putting paint on it. It's more like a canvas where you form the canvas itself into bumps in the middle. The "foreground" is the bumpy shapes, because they stand out in your attention. The "background" is the un-bumped areas surrounding it, which you tend to ignore.

> >The word "background" has a connotation of passivity. Are you saying that your ultimate nature is one of passivity?

Hopefully my refreshed imagery counters that. If you "are the canvas" then the so-called "background" is just the infinite expanse which does not currently have a pattern. As the "canvas", you can form into any shape you like. Of course, there will always be more "background" than not, because the canvas goes on forever. Also, missing from this metaphor, is the fact that most of this "canvas" is unstructured - as in, 3-dimensional space itself is a pattern.

On Realism and Not

Okay, that makes things clearer. For me, 'philosophical realism' would be the idea that there is an aspect of reality that exists independent of your perceptions and thoughts about reality. A more 'general realism' would go further and say that what you perceive has a direct correspondence with reality (the version you mean). So it's maybe actually better to go for the negative term you suggest, 'anti-realism', which is unambiguous in saying 'there's no objective reality outside *this*'. Whether that leads to solipsism or just an admission of non-provability is icing on the cake.

Anyway, I've gone meandering there...

For the subjective idealist, what he experiences *is* reality. There is no behind-the-scenes. There may be regularities in his experience, but they are not "caused" by some external structure - they are their own cause, they are habits. There are no limits, potentially, to what might be true, or how reality might apparently "work", or how things might be structured *internally*.

The subjective idealist recognises the room around him as a floating image, transparent and without solidity - without *origin*, even, except from himself.

> >Now, I am a subjective idealist, and to me nothing I experience is reality because it doesn't satisfy 1 or 2 above 50%.

Perhaps it is better to avoid the terms 'real' and 'reality' because they are difficult to use in a formal sense. For this discussion, yes experience is 'unreal' because the is no external backing to it. (Hence dismissing both philosophical realism and general realism.)

For the general reader, they tend to think in terms of 'my reality', say. In this sense, for the subjective idealist *all* of experience is reality - there is no secret substrate behind the scenes. One might say "mind" or "awareness" is the true reality, I suppose. But this doesn't work in the same way as we say "matter" is the reality in materialism, because experiences are 'made from' mind in idealism, whereas experiences are not 'made from' matter in materialism.

But anyway, we can happily agree that subjective idealism is - of course - not realist.

> >"The subjective idealist recognises the room around him as a floating image, transparent and without solidity - without origin, even, except from himself."; This I think is a skillful image you paint, however, this isn't what "reality" is, is it?

Seems to be, to me? ;-) You know what I mean though, from the paragraph above.

> I agree that there is no substrate, but there is a secret "behind" the senses (although not literally behind).

Right. I've tried to convey that in the past using metaphors (of course) of things being "enfolded" and so on. To communicate that 'everything is here right now' even if it is not presently in the form of sensations.

> That's why the Daoist sages say, visions blind the eye, sounds deafen the ear.

As the sun hides the stars.

> Well, my preferred species of it isn't at least [not realist]. Maybe you prefer the realist flavor? I currently lean toward anti-realism.

And meanwhile, these terms are so unfortunate - mixed in as they are with 'being an idealist/realist' in the sense of pragmatism. Bah. Notions of realism/anti-realism can seem almost constrained to a materialist-type framework (or rather, a dual view). I probably don't tend to think in those terms at all, until it comes up in conversation. I've always taken things to be "real at what they are", even before getting into Berkeley and then moving on. Not through deliberate choice, probably through ignorance initially, in fact. Thoughts were "real thoughts", chairs were "real chairs", experiences are "real experiences". I was very quickly into the idea, because of playing with memory and stuff being my first interest, that any notion of a "real world behind the scenes" as itself just a thought within my mind, in the same "place" as the world in my mind.

> I think so. ;) I am convinced that I know what you mean.

I'm convinced that you think you know too. ;-)

> I'd say we're at different angles to each other. The way you put it makes it seem like there is an objective world that's neutral to all of us.

Not as intended: Literally, my experience is that I am 'positioned' in the world in one sense - and in a more configurational sense I am 'angled' to other perspectives.

> I doubt that my mind can really be called "small." The error in Kant's view is that he reserves an area of mind which belongs to nobody, as it were (or maybe it belongs to God in his view). Thus he objectifies subtly an aspect of his experience.

Berkeley and others do this too. It's because they implicitly use a spatial metaphor. There is no notion, say, of space and time also being structures, patterns in awareness either - so they are left trying to make connections across a fictional gap.

> See, I too believe that not everything is consciously obvious in my present experience.

Yes. It's all there. And we seem to agree that the metaphors of levels, hierarchies, dimension, sizes, distances - they are convenient terms to use when getting a particular point across, but they are in no sense 'objectively true'; that is not how things are actually organised.

Language is spatial and temporal, so it is understood that temporary compromises have to be made for the purposes of communication.

> >At the same time, even though you may be different from me, you aren't George, and I am not Nefandi. We may become one and the same perspective in one and the same being. And we may remain as though separate. However, there is no way to establish anything objectively...

Experientially, we can observe that the "place we are looking out from" - if we direct our attentions in the opposite direction - is unstructured, unified. We are looking out from the same place. So in that sense, we are the same.

> >Can you flip this around? What if we take the bumps to be the background and the unbumped surface to be the foreground? If you can do this instantly, you've preserved your mental flexibility.

Well, I actually do think of this as a bit of a figure/ground image. You can do a similar thing in the room right now: just bring the space between objects into the foreground, making the space the "object" and the objects the "space". (It takes a little practice, that, or it did for me.)

> >Space is a subtle concept, but really to say that I am a space is too limiting.

Actually, I was trying to be clear there that we *are not* space - that "space" is another subtle structure that is experienced (and therefore not us). As is "narrative". We can't actually experience what we are, we just *are it*. Which is why it is, well, of infinite capacity and potential.

> >I can be said to be outside all things, or even unrelated to things at all, having no definite relationship to things.

Outside of all things, *and yet also all things*. No relationship to things, *but all relationships between things*. That's the problem with being God: it's so darned hard to find the words to describe One-self, eh? :-)

> >It's possible to read something like what you wrote, and come away with the attitude of "well, since nothing we say is exactly correct . . . I like the attitude that comes out this way "well, nothing we say will be exactly correct, still . . .

Right. Now, this isn't a problem for 'informed discussion' - we both know that there is a moon we are "pointing to", as it were. However, without that knowledge it can seem that we're really saying that it's totally arbitrary! It should be striving for the best way to communicate during a particular discussion - picking the best metaphors for the particular point.

Which is why dialogue like this is important. Going back and forward, trying different images, until one or a combination of them works (sometimes a combination that is in logical conflict, but overall captures the properties).

> >"Place we are looking out from"; I don't think I understand this one fully. What are some of the more interesting implications of this?

It's that we can each directly experience that we must all be looking out from the same, um, experience. That "being" thing. Basically: point your finger at your face, follow where it's pointing with your attention to "where you are looking out from", notice the complete structurelessness of it. Everyone has that same "source" in their experience. It's also a quick way of switching to the "background" rather than the "foreground". (Caveats apply to those terms, as discussed.)

> >We shouldn't try to describe God in terms of a static picture. God cannot be photographed or painted. Instead we should describe God's tendencies, such a tendency toward limitlessness and freedom, a tendency toward playfulness, etc.

Hmm. Never static, and yet always the same. I like the description you used there. *Playfulness* has always seemed like a great word to use.

[...]

> >He never even once abandons the formula to just say "there is no self." In one Sutta the Buddha is asked point blank if self exists, and he remains silent. Surely that was a great opportunity to say "self doesn't exist." But the Buddha passes up on that opportunity and doesn't go there.

This is true. That is because the true self is not a "thing" and is not of "things"; it can neither exist nor not-exist. Only objects can exist or not-exist, and there is no object involved here. Where it is tricky is that we talk of this through the "puppet" of this personality, an adopted shape for expression. The desires and actions and views of the puppet are arbitrary. There is, in a sense, nothing there. There is no *objective* self therefore.

> >The puppet doesn't come bundled with its own will.

I agree. That's why I said "through" the puppet personality. The puppet has no causal power, it is merely a pattern through which experience can be funnelled. Since it has limitation - because it has form - if you accidentally identify with the puppet, you will limit your abilities. Or, worse (and more accurately), you will associate *some* parts of experience with yourself and your intention, and the rest will seem to happen to you, even though it sometimes mysteriously reflects your feelings, for the good or the bad.

This leads to: What aspects of your experience are due to your misidentification with the puppet, and what aspects are due to your true self?

How do you distinguish, say, between *puppet* desires (wants that arise from the structure and world-as-perceived-by the puppet) and true desires, those that arise from *being the universe* and knowing everything.

> >After all, identifying with a puppet happens at a pre-puppet level, so it is an aspect of my true self.

Well, it happens within awareness, just as any identification with other world (pattern/object) aspects. You are still just *looking* at the puppet-pattern, but confusing it is "you" because it's all you see, seeing the thoughts seeded from the pattern as "yours" in a more global sense than they are.

Important: *There are no levels*. Where would levels be? There are no hierarchies either. Those are conceptual, organisational frameworks: thoughts. Everything is at the same level, even different granularities.

> I don't. And I don't recommend anyone try that. Instead one should evaluate desires not in terms of true/false but in terms of skillfulness, in terms of the outcomes they lead to, etc.

Those evaluations will themselves come via your identification or focus. The thoughts that appear will arise consistent with the puppet-structure if you're still attached to it. In other words, the desires associated with the puppet, that arise through the filter of its patterns are *deformed* and not what the larger you desires (necessarily). It's what you *think* you would want *if you were just the person the puppet thinks it is*. This isn't just about yachts. Even the desire to live forever or have infinite power could be a desire sourced/filtered via the puppet-pattern. Until you release a hold on that pattern, then you won't feel the actual flow of your true self, or at least it will be eclipsed by the persistence of the puppet image. So, how do we tell what we, as our true self, truly desires?

Well, in a sense the puppet-pattern is responsible for the thoughts that emanate from it, but only in the sense that the a whirlpool is responsible for its shape. Causally, of course, it's doing nothing.

It may well be that the only way to notice that you are not the puppet us for the puppet-pattern (or world-pattern as unfolding via the puppet-pattern) to result in such a thought.

Fundamental awareness has no desires, of course. It is already complete.

> >You need to stop saying that the puppet is responsible for something.

Perhaps let's say "associated with" thoughts that appear related to the pattern. The pattern, the puppet and the world, actually appear within you. You are not a person, you are *aware of* a person and a world *through* a person. And yet, all that those things are, are you. So you have ultimate responsibility.

> > >”Fundamental awareness has no desires, of course.”; That's not true.

How can structureless openness have desires? There is nowhere it wants to be, nowhere it wants to go, nothing it wants to become. Only *patterns within awareness* can change, have a direction, have a desire (= an unfulfilled tendency) and move towards it.

So, the puppet-pattern can have desires, the world-pattern can have desires. You as awareness can facilitate or obstruct those desires manifesting by holding into forms, patterns and preventing them changing - or instead allowing movement, or even more directly updating the patterns to accelerate change (however this comes with penalties re:balance and stability).

[...]

This thread is the more interesting one...
...it's the "*the territory is/becomes the map*" thread.

Reply to “Not all insanity is created equal.”

> >And to have no thoughts easily and reliably you literally need to have no concerns about anything. You need to be certifiably insane.

It can be a *positive* stance, Zen style: that you understand that the appropriate action will occur to you in any circumstances if you let it, since you are part of the larger movement of the world; and recognise that thinking about things and planning actions in advance doesn't actually help you act appropriately.

Yeah, I see two types of thought:

- ***Unbidden thoughts*** as arising spontaneously from 'tension' or conflict of some sort, so trying to eliminate the thoughts while still retaining the conflict isn't going to happen. You either get rid of the tension by investigating it and resolving your conflict, or you simply accept it and release control, let go and let it unwind.
- ***Intentional* thinking** - deliberate rumination and planning - that's optional and you can simply decide not to do that. You may be an obsessive thinker, but you *can* decide to give up and let it go, and decide not to follow unbidden thoughts in to rumination territory.

Trying to deliberately fight the first type of thought will not work. "Good Zen" involves simply "sitting" and letting thoughts rise and fall and finish their business, remaining with sensations rather than trying to shut thinking down.

Leading to: surely "seeing all this as a dream" is the ultimate in letting go of personal control and localised (bodily) tension, since we then identify as the whole thing? It's all an "expression of you", after all.

> >I don't think any authentic Zen masters considered the world something larger than themselves. And neither do I.

No, they considered the world within themselves, but the *character* they were experiencing was part of that world. So concerns about the *character* acting appropriately are misplaced. (And mostly when we talk of action in everyday life, we are speaking of that *character*.)

> >It depends on what you mean by "personal."

I mean, controlling your "body" (mental or physical) directly - intentional thought and physical control - and by retaining tension in it as a defensive/conflict management approach. What I really mean is, if you truly accept this is a dream, then many of your concerns would evaporate - you would release your grasp - because those concerns are for the survival of the *character*, not the dream.

> >Maybe? It's not 100% certain.

For sure, there are different folks and different strands. Most of the stuff I've explored seems to come to this though. Zazen is an allowing rather than a striving.

> >I don't equate my person with any specific body.

Sure, but most people do, and I'm talking about how a person moves from one view and way of living to another. For clarity: "who you really are" is everything, whilst "people", including "your body", are characters/mental objects within that.

> >Zazen allows striving and relaxation...

I don't think we're actually disagreeing. It's a "lively sitting". The point I made before (see other response) is that the point isn't to stamp out thoughts.

> >What do you mean by "everything"? Are you saying I am the sum total of the manifest things?

No, you are that in which the apparent manifest things appear.

If you can conceive of yourself that way, then you can conceive of yourself any way you like.

If you can see yourself as a formless container that takes on the form of the objects of experience, then equally you can identify with any object, or configuration of time and space.

Once you've hit "openness", then you can pick and choose. Being able to *choose* to limit yourself - for fun or curiosity - is the greatest freedom.

One might say that our present localised experience is a limitation we freely chose at some point, but we don't remember.

Moving on: The initial pitch was mixing subjective idealism with chaos magick, but we haven't really explored that much.

I did spot that post, actually. I thought this was interesting:

> *"If you tell your friends, the world will change to make the event mundane. It will turn out that someone left the pad in some sort of diagnostics mode or there will be a software bug that allows 10% of random codes to work or something like that."*

This is true, in my experience. The universe (heheh) strives for self-consistency. Open the door, there's a room beyond; seek an explanation, and one is provided.

But also:

> *"Magic isn't about making unnatural things happen, it's about making natural things happen at the right times and places."*

I just founding it interesting that someone would phrase it that way. I think that *if one does not specify the route the result will take*, then it adopts natural processes as the mechanism, in accordance with your own understanding of what "natural" is. When you look for an explanation, one will appear which, again, fits in with your idea of what a reasonable explanation would be. The alternative is for you not to retain a memory of the change. (Often *others* don't retain memories pre-jump.)

I think coherence is semi-inherent. I think things arise in patterns across time rather than events, and so the 'world' tends to keep being 'of a piece'. Once you've accepted one thing, other things tend to fall in line with it, and so on.

If you're not a believer in such things, it could be that your 'reality' of your 'extended person' won't contain such experiences, and you'll subjectively 'split off' if something like that's going to happen.

Not the best wording. That the world will tend to serve up experiences in line with your beliefs, and that your memories will tend to correspond to your current experience. Your subjectivity would 'split off' rather than give you an experience which wasn't coherent (wasn't consistent with itself).

Yes. An unwitting strategy though. It's either avoided, or edited out.

> In our current reality "don't like strangeness" probably describes most people, right?

Whether they realise it or not, yes.

[...]

The problem would be, can you overcome the *momentum* of experiential habits such as these?

You fear a *personal* death. And to be sure, to genuinely confront the nature of yourself and of your world, will indeed involve your death in a fundamental sense. What seems insane on this side of the jump, won't be on the other.

Say: If you genuinely experienced the world around you as a dream, and yourself as a dream figure, then the solid, material everydaymotherfucker would be no more. You would be part of a larger movement.

You have to *give*. *up*. (Your personal self. Not a life.)

Stop thinking, my friend. Just stop. *You cannot work this out by thinking.* The other side, as it were, isn't "over there" - it's "in here" and all around you. It's not even a "side", it's where you've been (and what you've been) all along. So no need to worry! :-)

I'm going to give you a daily practice to do, and other than that you're just going to get on with your life, and see what happens, okay? Stabilisation is key. Here it is:

- 10 minutes, twice a day.
- Lie down *on the floor*, feet flat with knees bent, head supported by books, arms by your side or hands resting on abdomen. (Like this.)



- Decide to give up completely to gravity: to "play dead".
- Let go of your body and mind, let them move as they will. Allow them to unwind.
- Don't even "pay attention"; just let your attention be open and wide. If it focuses on some thought or pain briefly, let that happen, and let it open out again.

- After 10 minutes, decide to get up, but don't do anything about it. Wait until your body moves by itself. (This won't happen first time, but eventually it will happen.)

Basically, you are letting the "stuck thoughts" and "uncompleted movements" you have amassed unwind and dissolve themselves. You do not need to do anything for this to occur. Gradually, your perception will become clearer and clearer.

Note: Any effort to focus or do anything will get in the way. There is a method of accelerating this by "overwriting yourself", but it's nicer this way.

This is *all* you need to do for now. As you go about your day, if you feel yourself becoming tense or defensive or worried, take a breath and just mentally recall the last time you were there, supported, by the whole universe. Okay? Trust in that.

I should write a post on it really...

Rather than allow the "mental objects" in the space of awareness to gradually unwind and dissolve, you can overwrite space to be empty by *direct intention*, summoning the extended feeling. However, it means you get no acclimatisation and you are completely evaporating the boundaries very quickly. It involves confronting an existential fear of openness. Imagine if you wished the floor disappeared, casually, and suddenly it turned into an infinite void! You might be... uncomfortable with that! :-)

There's no rush, though; I think it's better to do it the gradual way. Note that Nefandi and I are pushing the edges in our discussion; there's no reason to commit so fully in my opinion, until one feels that they are at that stage (or even ever, as you see fit).

[...]

> >So what you call "unbidden" I'd call "irritating." They're still your thoughts even if you don't like them.

Surely, but the difference is useful. I can sit here and generate and pursue thoughts deliberately. If thought are arising from conflict though - even if that conflict is an ongoing and maintained conflict through unconscious intention - they are still unbidden, in the sense that I was not intending thought as the outcome. All experience is intentional at route, however there is a difference between direct outcomes and indirect. In the *direct creation of thought* one simply has to stop creating them. In the *indirect creation of though* one has to stop doing whatever-the-indirect-thing is (in this case, the maintenance of conflict or tension).

> >I strongly disagree. This isn't good Zen at all.

Okay, context is all: the point I was trying to make is that "Good Zen" doesn't involve quenching thoughts by trying to stamp on them, that's a problem and muddling up with modern Western meditation nonsense. It is a staying-with, and more.

> >Sakyamuni said to the vast assembly, "Through sitting in the lotus posture then samadhi is realized in the bodymind and its virtue and dignity can be recognized by the people. Just as the sun illumines the world so the mind is cleared of dullness, laziness, and indolence. The body is bright and not dull. Perception and cognition are also bright and supple. You should sit like dragons coiled. Just the image of the lotus posture brings fear to king of the demons of delusion.

> How much more so should he see someone sitting without collapsing or leaning but actually experiencing the truth?

Quite so.

All good. And nice quote. "Investigation" is a good word. It's not an effortful investigation, or a manipulative one, it's an exploration of *what-is*.

Reply to “Hindu Mythology Metaphor”

Hmm, as you have uncovered more "knowledge", do you think your approach to living has shifted?

I guess I'm suggesting: is your attempt to *deliberately apply* metaphysics effortfully as a manipulative tool maybe presenting a barrier to your success with it, whereas before you were more flowing your life via intention from within it?

I think where we go wrong is that we try to work things out, we get hung up on technique, but the truth is... *there is no mechanism*. Simply *deciding* is all that is required. To *decide* something is to have the pattern of "something" in mind plus the pattern of "it happening". That is sufficient, provided you do not then block it.

Everything else is just... stirring the water, splashing about, obscuring things, fragmenting ourselves and therefore our experience. Actually, there is nothing to know, no structure behind things, no solid substrate supporting the world beyond imagination.

Forget mantras for that maybe, you need to take a different approach. Check out the top two posts in this subreddit. Basically, you want to lie down one day... and never get up. Switch to being the background space. Only experience "getting up happening". Extra bit: Mantras are only needed because we don't understand *willing* and so need a "second cause" to allow ourselves to make a change. But all change is just *will*, changing the shape of ourselves by... changing the shape of ourselves.

[...]

[Reposting my reply from elsewhere, for completeness.]

“Can a Mantra be a Metaphor?”; Good question! Some thoughts:

If we abstract these terms out into "patterns" then, effectively yes. To say a word is to trigger its associated patterns. Meanwhile, a metaphor is simply a *named set* of overlapping relationships (patterns), connected and associated with an *unnamed set* of overlapping relationships (patterns).

To say the word "owl" is to trigger the associated patterns of "birds", "wings", "big eyes", 'tree branches", "Blade Runner Voight-Kampff Test", "Rachael", "night-time", etc.

To *think-about* an owl is to do the same.

“On archetypes”; Gods and Goddesses, owls and archetypes, they are all just triggers for pre-existing extended patterns which cannot be encapsulated in a word or an image, but can be triggered or intensified by them.

All possible patterns are here, now, in your experience - it's just that some are more intensely activated than others. To feel better (simplistically speaking) you want to allow the "bad feeling" to fade and a "good feeling" to become more intense. How to do? "Detach" from your current experience and "allow" it to shift; trigger a pattern which implies the desired state. Literally, you are a wide-open perceptual space with some experiential patterns more intense than others. You don't "heal" so much as "allow experience to apparently shift". More accurately: you can't *change* anything, you can only let the present pattern dim and intensify an alternative pattern by "recalling" it.

Reply to “Trying to hash some stuff out for myself, would appreciate your thoughts.”

> >How does the oneironaut remain committed to any view in particular?

You get to choose your metaphor deliberately, and having experiences accordingly. It you *don't* choose or if you botch together an incoherent worldview, you'll find yourself in an incoherent world.

> >I think I'm just not convinced that manipulating reality is worth the effort because if normal and mundane things aren't real, why bother with trying to change them?

Well, they are only "not real" in the sense that there is no secret, hidden, solid world behind the scenes beyond the "habitual regularities" of experience. It's perfectly real as an experience, in the same way that a thought is a real thought. You can just leave things alone if you want, let your current patterns roll on...

> >But still, it seems like I actually can't stop manipulating reality.

You can let it alone by not updating anything (the apparent world will just run along its current trajectory). Experience will just appear in alignment with the *facts-of-the-world* as you left them. But it's also important to realise that you can't experience yourself doing the changing. To *will* is to change your own shape; you only ever experience the results, although you "know" that you are *willing*.

> >Basically I feel like there is no ground for me to take a position on that would make me feel that one way of perceiving reality is ultimately better than another.

Just choose one. For fun. You don't need to believe anything (belief isn't causal, it is simply what one thinks is worth intending, or assumes is happening anyway). You are right that there's no ground. Even your current "you" perspective is arbitrary.

There are no answers, only choices.

> >it's just that I have been taking "enlightenment" so freaking seriously

Let "enlightenment" take care of itself. Or: sit down and close your eyes and imagine that you are the empty space of the room, then expand it out. Don't *think-about* being that, instead actually imagine *being* it, adopting the shape of being it. Keep doing that until all you are is empty space.

That's not quite it. :-)

> >But in waking life I seem to forget about this.

We let go of many things but often we forget to let go of *attention*.

Check whether you do this: when you are doing something, such as looking at a computer screen, do you narrow your experience to it (focus your attention on it) or do you *include* it into your experience (leave your attention open)? Try the latter. Notice that you do not need to narrow your attention ("concentrate") in order to achieve things. It is *intention* that dictates what gets done, not *attention*.

In fact, you'll maybe realise that the usual reason you narrow your attention - to block out distractions when trying to "focus" - is actually *caused* by narrowing attention. Distractions are actually a "here I am" signal to open out attention again, as are aches and pains, often.

I suggest that, if you don't already do something similar, you adopt a daily exercise like the passive version of *Overwriting Yourself*. Basically, just lie down and let yourself - but in particular your attention - unwind without interference.

If you narrow your attention down, what happens is that your whole body effectively tries to cram itself into that small space! You get very tense, and your body often ends up in what amounts to an emergency mode. Even people who know about "letting go" of their bodies and thoughts often don't realise that they are still controlling their attention, because attention isn't a "thing" or a "sensation", it's more of a filtering.

You shouldn't be controlling anything through effort. Your job is to "direct" and "let happen".

So my general advice is:

- Before working, imagine yourself to be the background space in the room - actually "feel out" into that space.
- Rest the centre of your attention - "where you are looking out from" - somewhere along the centre line of your body. Perhaps halfway back in your head, or even in your lower body. Wherever feels good and like "home". (Probably at the moment you are "sitting" too far forward, right behind your eyes.)
- When you work at the computer, do not focus your attention onto it. Instead, leave your "space" open and allow your body to move at the pace it wants to.
- Do not not "effort" yourself. You are not meant to be physically wrestling with your work. If you leave your attention open, you'll probably find this subsides naturally. If you are in a calm state, you should feel that your body is "moving by itself".

The attention thing is hard to describe, but once you've had the experience it all makes sense!

It's perspectives all the way down...

Reply to “Letting things be and changing what you want”

> [[OP: I'm inspired by what I thought was going to be a simple question with a simple answer over at /r/meditation, on the conflicting nature of the OP's belief system: they were torn between the notion of "letting things be" and "doing anything possible to accomplish their goal." Obviously, the latter is a destructive and ignorant idea to say the least, and is cause for much nonsense in our world today. I ran into some problems though, because I realize that I too am torn, maybe in a bit more subtle of a way, between the notion of intending or allowing things as they are. Creation and detachment I guess you could say. The problem is essentially the same as the other OP's. If I'm intending, doesn't that directly imply dissatisfaction with the moment I'm in? How can I be dissatisfied if I'm completely accepting? The struggle.
>
> 'Let things be because whatever is to happen will happen' and 'Do whatever you possibly can to achieve your goal'?
>
> Maybe I'm more torn by this than I let on. Can I really accept things not going the way I want? I know they will eventually come around, but can I let the world have this space or must I choke it with my doubt and anxiety to claim certainty? The choice sounds easy but it can evade you if you aren't aware you're making it.]]

Well, I don't see the problem and perhaps it's a misunderstanding of things in modern interpretation.

In meditation, you "let things be" in order to let the noise subside and, in the subsequent calm, realise how things actually are (that there is the sensory experience, and stories *about* that experience are fictional and malleable). Having had that realisation, you are free to operate in alignment with the actual nature of things. You can simply let the current pattern unfolds dynamically without interference, like waves bouncing off each other in an ever-evolving but self-consistent manner, or you can use your will and imagination to tweak it now and again, like briefly splashing your hand into the water. "Everything is fine as it is" is a comment about the perfection of the self-consistent pattern, which has no choice but to unfold logically and perfectly. If you assert changes into the world, the shifted pattern will *also* be self-consistent and perfect. The world-pattern *always* makes sense. But some patterns might be more fun than others...

Summary:

- "Letting things be" is an approach to settling and understanding.
- The world-pattern is always perfect, *in the sense of being a coherent, self-consistent pattern*.
- Some patterns are more fun than others.
- Changing the pattern is fine. The new one will be perfect too.

However, it's true that the more detached you are, the easier the world-pattern shifts, and the more likely your world falls into line with your desires without your deliberate intervention - desire and pattern close their gap.

Let's ponder! What is a desire?

I'm going to suggest a desire is an indication of the gap between what you are experiencing and what you should be experiencing - the sense of tension is because you are and have been preventing a movement of the world-pattern by holding onto it, and have through manipulation and ignorance deviated from your genuine wants. We might say this situation arose *due to* ignorance and intentions made from that ignorance, but desire

itself does not come from ignorance; it's just a symptom of a state, a pendulum that is being held away from its rest position.

As I suggest in the last paragraph of my other comment: if you're totally detached, then your world-pattern shifts naturally towards alignment. Once you are near, intervention isn't required so much.

However, the fact is that we've *all* accumulated pushed patterns. Letting this "karma" unravel itself by itself takes time, just as any disturbance takes time to settle. And during that settling process, you might endure much unpleasantness. Unless you are able to absolutely and complete detach, in which case you might get something more akin to a "dream restart". But for as long as you are attached to the habit of continuity and plausibility, this won't happen. Intending with detachment is a way of quickly switching to the target pattern. The combination of detachment - implicitly in a direction, justifying your "allowing" - and actual specification of a target - which you have already decided to permit - lets you jump more directly to the wanted world-pattern.

Not sure that was clear at all, sorry. The short version: desire is a sign that your world-pattern has been pushed into a now-inappropriate state; intending with detachment is a quick way to resolve that because it temporarily suspends some habits.

If you were completely detached and allowing, then having a desire would *be* intending, and the world-pattern would stay in sync. Because desire = pattern in consciousness and intention = pattern in consciousness; the two should match; detaching and allowing is the process by which desires / intentions are integrated into the world-pattern; a desire is like a self-triggering intention.

Let me add: Perfection refers to complete self-consistency. It does not mean everything is in some final, all-things-complete, stable state. That never happens, for as long as there is any pattern at all.

The world-pattern is always perfect because it always "makes sense", but it is always evolving. Desire is an indication you have been obstructing that natural momentum in some way. It will always resolve itself eventually, the question is how: by overwhelming your resistance, by you partially detaching and letting it flow more easily, by you intending towards it (accelerated jump), by you detaching absolutely, or by you intending directly to a balanced state (discontinuous jump).

> >I'll be frank and say that I am fearful of discontinuities.

That's reasonable. There's the feeling that if you let this happen, *anything* could happen - which is about right. At least at the moment you have, at the very least, the illusion that people remain the same people, and so on. A big shift means that this might not be true "anymore".

> >So would you say that having desires at all is a sign that one is ignorant, at least to a small degree?

I'd still say that it is a sign that you have *acted based on ignorance* in the past. We all do this: we all lug our bodies around by effort, for example, accumulating tension, when we are not meant to "manually control" our bodies at all. You might say that your aching body is because you have *used it in ignorance*.

Extend this to the entirety of your world.

> >I've lately been experimenting with the idea that we, consciousness, could be thought of as knowledge itself.

Well, I'd say what you are is "that which is". It's not a knowledge, it's *being*. Knowledge implies a knower and a known, whereas you are the knower *and* that which knowledge is made from. So we are not just knowledge itself, we are what everything is. If by "knowledge" you just mean "all the facts of the world", then you are definitely all knowledge and all knowledge is you, but you are also so much more - unbounded.

Hmm. Yeah, I still think that it's just easier to view ourselves as being awareness and therefore everything that appears in awareness is also us. "We are recall" rather than "we are memories". Knowledge is not a thing.

> "The only reality is mind and observations, but observations are not of things. To see the Universe as it really is, we must abandon our tendency to conceptualize observations as things."
>
> -- *The Mental Universe*, Richard Conn Henry

An extra thought: Do we take these things too seriously? If experience is about *adventuring* then swooping about between possibilities, making mistakes and jumping out of them, is part of the fun perhaps.

If we could know for certain that we would exist as a conscious perspective forever and could retain our identity and memories for as long as you wanted - *until we chose to wipe them temporarily or permanently* - how would that change your approach do you think?

Hmm. It's hard to balance something: Knowing you can "jump away" from unpleasant situations should they arise, frees you to experiment more and commit more. But at the same time, having this knowledge potentially lessens the emotional intensity of an experience.

Probably it sorts itself out: We forget our power, but when in dire trouble we tend to seek out answers, and in the process rediscover that power.

But that does mean that ignorance, acting from ignorance, desire and intention, rediscovery and realignment, god and then... not - all those are inevitable.

Yes, you have to immerse yourself to have fun as "the actor" playing the character, but you can also take glee in the creativity of being "the director". You do have to shift your mindset to do that though.

[...]

> >Once you've set the intention it's there.

Yes, because the intending *actually is the making-it-there*. If you intend "owls" then that *is* the overlaying of the pattern called "owls" upon the world, which you subsequently encounter as your attention scans over time. You are basically saying "from now on: owls", and experience unfolds logically from this from that point onwards. (Including, amusingly, experiences "about the past". Which means you discover that there are now apparently "owls" in your past where there weren't before.)

The world-pattern itself isn't intelligent - only complex. However, it is entirely responsive to being reshaped by *your* intelligence.

I'm inclined to think that past, present and future thinking are all fine when done *with intention*. Being "present" really means "being present to experience", and that can mean thought as much as senses. After all, thoughts are essentially sensory experiences, just not the primary ones at that point.

Reply to “A physicalism-breaking experience while high last night”

[[AesirAnatman (OP): I basically have no doubts about physicalism anymore, but last night I had a simple experience which is fundamentally impossible in the physicalist worldview, or makes physicalism a useless worldview.

I got high last night for the first time in over a year after having been a habitual smoker for years. Overall, it was meh. I didn't like the forgetfulness that came with it. But my mind was a lot...looser than normal.

So, I played with my experience a bit. I'm confident what I did can be done without drugs because I have done similar activities sober. Here's what I did: I stared at a light fixture for a while and developed some deep afterimages of the lights when I closed my eyes. Then, with my eyes closed, I played with my perception of the afterimages. After a couple minutes of practice, I was able to take the afterimages from different bulbs and move them around in my closed-eye vision. I could form different shapes and such out of the afterimages.

What I realized was that THIS SHOULD BE IMPOSSIBLE, according to the physicalist model of mind. In that view, these are physical, external alterations in nerves/brain-space - they aren't my imagination. And yet I could totally twist them up in any way I wanted to.

The alternative interpretation of this phenomena, for a physicalist, would be that your entire subjective reality is an epiphenomena of your brain. This would allow for the radical alteration of the epiphenomena without threatening the external world. As I got to thinking about this alternative, I realized that the implication would be that I'm actually living inside my brain. What I recognize as my body and brain and realm are all phenomena produced in my real brain which is 'out there' somewhere in the mysterious 'external reality' which I have no experience of. It also implies that if I can transform the epiphenomena of light afterimages, I could in principle also transform the epiphenomena of the walls of my house and dissolve epiphenomena of physical objects trivially, like I could trivially alter my perception of afterimages - granted, in a view like this, altering your perception in dramatic ways risks dangers and death. In this version of physicalism, you aren't experiencing a real world in the first place. The use of empirical evidence to argue for the existence of an external brain is inconsistent, of course, in this view. This view would be better understood in terms of a Kantian-type idealist perspective on an unknown external reality. That has its own problems as a metaphysical model.

I'm fascinated by how such a simple experience can completely undermine an entire worldview. If this is easy to learn sober, it may be a useful way for people to convince themselves of the illusory nature of physicality.]]

You can certainly bend the visual field with practice; senses and thoughts occur in the same space and the of the same thing. It doesn't necessarily negate physicality in and of itself - after all, the "standard interpretation" of materialism is indeed that the senses produce electrical signals in the brain and that's where "your world" is. In a way, this can be used as proof that perception isn't direct and is in fact brain-based!

Making that explicit *does* give you the first step on the way to unravelling things philosophically, though.

It's definitely true that having direct experiences like this (which point out that you are not actually *experiencing* a solid 3D world even if you *are* in one) is far more groundbreaking that just thinking a lot about it.

I'll clarify: Direct experiences *of the flexibility of their perceptions* rather than simply thinking about how they should-or-could be flexible. I'm more referring to bending the visual field in front of us, rather than just OP's behind-the-eyes effects.

Yeah, I think that *anything* can jog you out of assumption if you are being attentive, because it's attentiveness itself which does the jogging. What really changes your view is a new context: once you've noticed that everything is of-a-piece with an undivided background, the taste of transparency does it. But if you're not even attending...

> >I don't think playing with visuals behind the eyes is going to be of a lot of use to normal, sober, ordinary people...

Or, if it's done while *already knowing* what you are looking for and experimenting with. In which case you are not discovering anything, you're already a convert and are *exploring* it.

Personally, I think even a flash of accidentally dropping your hold on attention - brief exposure to unboundedness - can achieve more insight than years of messing around with meditation and so on (valuable for other reasons though they may be).

And if you are lucky enough to just *put faith* in those ideas, even better - because then you can knowingly "take on the shape of" the experience of openness. This is really a case where the more of a thinker you are, the longer you can end up delaying the actual direct knowledge. You are play-doh and haven't realised it; the only way to realise that you can adopt a different shape is to... adopt a different shape.

Reply to “We talk a lot about getting away from the consensus on this sub, lets talk about methods of escape.”

I'm trying to do a short version of that overwriting exercise whenever I come across something where I am avoidant or fearful (in an out-of-my-comfort-zone way). This frees me up to make a proper choice about whether to do something or not, rather than just out of habit or because I'm just vaguely worried about it - and see things as sensory experiences rather than my assumptions about it.

Hopefully the idea is to be more aware of the conventions I am following, less bound to them.

[...]

[[Nefandi: “mostly from no longer believing that what goes on in my imagination is fake and whats out there as being real”; This type of observation is key. In order to undermine convention really thoroughly I need to become aware of my most subtle trends and the tacit, silent, unspoken reasons that underpin those trends. Another one from this series is the idea that there are objects that can bump into each other and displace each other, that compete with each other for space, etc.

Another subtle idea is that whatever appears visually is more indicative of an outer world, and whatever appears to touch (body sense) is more indicative of an inner world. Example: I am itching (tactile sense disturbed), but I see no bug and no red area on the skin (visual sense is not in line with the tactile). I think, "ah, it's just in my mind." Then! I see a bug and a red spot (visual sense is disturbed), but I am not at all itching (tactile sense is peaceful). Then I think "Oh, I really got bitten just now, even though I don't feel the itch." So when the sense fields fall out of harmony, it's obvious that they don't all take on the same import in the mind as to what they may signify. The fact that I am aware of this is incredibly useful in breaking down convention. I am seeing how ridiculous it is to use one sense to mean *that* and another sense to mean *this* (this and that, that and this). It's totally arbitrary. Nothing is forcing me to think this way. And so on. There are more ideas/insights like this.

They are very very subtle and they're generally very hard to notice, but noticing them detonates the convention much more than any kind of repetitive exercise. I don't think we can exercise our way to a sense of absurdity, and it's exactly this sense of absurdity that undermines convention. Still, exercise is incredibly useful as it often (if not always) serves as a fertile ground for contemplation which can then generate an appropriate sense of absurdity. So I am not really poo-pooing exercise as much as I am trying to put things in a perspective that I myself find very powerful in my own life.

Of course what happens next is exactly as you describe, because once you for example stop thinking that imagination is fake and non-imagination (whatever the heck it is) is real, it alters how you live your life. So when you do find your manner of living grossly or subtly altered, that's a good sign that you've probably hit upon an authentic change of mind.]]

Good point. The whole identification of certain senses with your "spatial perimeter", combined with the assumption that events occurring within a certain timeframe after an intention defines your "temporal perimeter", is a powerful illusion.

From elsewhere:

It's great talking about the illusion of space and being connected, but unless I can look around and *see it to be true* then what's the use?

So I think we always need to start with our actual experience, and there are two aspects of it which are probably key:

- How do I come to mark out one area of my present moment experience as "me" and the rest of it as "not-me"?
- How do I actually create movements and thoughts - if indeed I can detect myself doing so?

And my answers are: That it seems pretty arbitrary how I divide up the world (I think of it as being divided but it isn't really when I look), and that I seem to just "want it" and a bit later the experience happens (so I just assume my limitations are based on sensation and distance and time).

So I don't know about connected, but things definitely don't seem to be *divided*.

> >but the first "step" is instant

Yes. This is where our common mistake comes from. Our intention *is* a reshaping of the universe. Just because we don't encounter the experience until later, we think either we didn't cause it, or that our 'prayers were answered' by some more circuitous route. Similar to our conversation a while ago about inserting facts into the future. It is true *now* that I will find the bookstore "later".

> >We maintain a narrative that describes a causal domain. A narrative as I mean it is more than just verbiage.

Yes. It's basically part of the assumed belief- or habit-structure of our world that dictates the form of our experience.

Also from elsewhere:

(Random bits of comments I keep meaning to gather together. Excuse the spatial/level metaphors, obviously they are not actual.)

The room around you is just a floating image. Its true source is deep down, enfolded. We confuse our sensory experience for being "the entire reality" but in fact all the good stuff happens elsewhere. Perhaps we might envisage it as: All *intentions*, even if apparently directed at the immediate surroundings, actually insert themselves at the lowest level of reality, undivided, and then bubble up everywhere. Even if you just decide to reach out and pick up your cup of coffee, that decision actually goes "the long way round". The *intention* creates a ripple at the very fundamental level, which then shifts the universe, which is then experienced "locally" as an image and sensation of your arm moving and a cup being held.

And because every *intention* inserts itself at the seed of the whole universe, you lifting a cup actually affects the whole of reality to a slight degree. If instead you had furiously smashed the cup on the ground, that violent *intention* might have shifted the whole universe slightly towards aggression: a painting in a gallery in Dusseldorf falls from the wall; a disagreement between two men in a bar in Iceland escalates into a punching match; a clear sky in Australia darkens and a storm begins.

>It's deeper in the mind, more toward the sub- and un-conscious regions of our own mind right here. Of course I do realize that you know it.

Yeah. There really is no way to escape from spatial metaphors, eh! The "elsewhere" is enfolded into the "apparent here", it's all here - etc.

One of the things I've been doing lately is deliberately 'being the space' and having present moment experience obviously floating within it, while maintaining the *felt-sense* of everything being in that space.

>The only time what you're saying is potentially true is if you've already taken up much of the known universe into your own being on a conscious level.

Yes, I agree. Actually, the image in my mind was of watching television news and seeing reports of things around the world happening. It is truer to say that smashing the cup with an "attitude" *can* affect the rest of your experience (the apparent world), not just the cup.

>one really needs to maintain a special kind of relationship

This is the interesting bit. Shall we talk about that? Is it simply a case of settling into that background sense, to connect with it? In other words, letting go of our hold on the present moment sensory experience to access the subtle layer? Like the sun hides the stars due to its proximity and intensity, so the texture of sensory momentary experience obscures the background dimensionless *felt-sense* of the world. When I switch my perspective to background awareness, I am no longer identified with my body sensations or the concept of my body, and my intentions manifest swiftly.

Recently someone mentioned how they "imagined their body was an empty shell" and would just command it to, say, find a lost object or jump a distance - and then let their body do it for them. Is this the sense in which we command change in the universe, insert a new fact and then let it bubble into experience?

>Or maybe it's the only way? It's hard to say for me right now.

I'm thinking that it's the only way - that all ways are basically *that* way at their core. I use words like "background" and "dimensionless" just to convey it's not an object or a thing.

>Is this 'switch' something vivid? Is it like a pop or a click?

No, you don't experience it like that, it's really a change of perspective rather than a click - like the feeling when you change which side of a figure-ground image you perceive. But there is a difference, because in figure-ground you lose the other perception completely. In this switch, it persists but differently due to context: So, say there is a room full of furniture. Your attention "latches on" to those objects all at once. Then you switch perspective to be aware of the space of the room. You are now perceiving the space of the room, the objects, *and* the space in which those objects appear/that they occupy. Really, it's just a releasing of attentional filtering.

If you're in-between perspectives at the moment, you may be experiencing something more like 'figure-ground' than 'figure-ground-and-space'.

Additional thought: Because we *are* all of experience, we can simply do this by 'just deciding'. (That's why people like Greg Goode can say - look, forget thinking it through and convincing yourself, just *take a stand as awareness* and see what happens. If it works, you know this stuff is right.)

> >When I want to insert a fact, I just train myself to expect it. This is probably not as efficient as what you're doing.

It's much the same in the end. It just might take a bit longer because you are wearing down the opposition to it, rather than letting go of the opposition?

> >I know I am not nearly as unhinged as I could in principle be. So my changes tend to be slow, especially if they are something I consider significant.

Yes, that's something interesting: the more significant, the more it's a "thing", the longer to push past.

[...]

> >then your energy is dispersed radially from that point

That's a good image. Freedom *from* vs freedom *to*. The purpose of dissolving limiting structures is surely to make more routes - and more efficient routes - available for the change from "here" to "there" to arise. (Simple belief that a target *will* become your experience can itself do a lot of "softening" of restrictions, mind you.)

Complete freedom from all structure and restriction is - empty space? Or - things exactly as they are now. Depending.

It's not an error that New Thought approaches were all about "ignore where you are, ignore the evidence, concentrate on the facts you *want* to be true".

Reply to “How feeling the emotion of lust affect my reality?”

Approach it in a more literal way, perhaps. What *exactly* appears in your experience - what is the "shadow-sensory" arising and the associated meaning - when you "lust"? However you answer this, that is the pattern that you are triggering into your world-experience subsequently.

Say you are lusting after owls ("twit-twoo, what lovely big eyes you have"):

- If the experience of that lusting is: "a 3rd-person image of an owl far away, and the feeling of hopeless distance" then that is the pattern you are triggering for both internal and external experience.
- If the experience of that lusting is: "an 1st-person image of my owl friends all around, laughing and feeling thoroughly feathered" then *that* is the pattern you are triggering for both internal and external experience.

The process is far more basic and "automatic" than you might think - ironically, because there is no mechanism to it. You aren't making changes in a spatially-extended deeper world, you are creating ripples in a pool. Just make sure the shapes you are rippling are nice ones, because they will persist in as superpositions in subsequent patterns.

In other words, the actual *imaginative content* is what matters here.

Perhaps right now, in a million personal reality-dreams, a million teenagers are waking up with a million Amanda Seyfrieds by their side! Or whoever. :-)

There's also the case that we are talking about superpositions of patterns. What other things have you put in place? And what is the implied "meta" aspect to the imagining; your implicit view of what you are doing.

If our teenage boy has this fantasy is he implicitly feel-thinking "oh wow this is amazing and so unlikely" or is he feel-thinking "yep, here I am, all is as it inevitably was-is going to be". There's a lot to be said for taking the attitude that imagining something is the experiencing *now* of a fact that *is actually in place* in the future, now. That meta-view is also a pattern linked to the imagining.

> [[Nefandi: “So the basic wisdom is that, feeling and thinking positive stuff will reflect on reality and give a positive life?”; Err, no? I think this is a perverted, simplistic version of intent that some people hope (or fear) is true. Intent is more straightforward than that and it has nothing to do with positive or negative per se. Whatever is intended, happens. But things we intend are almost never positive, rather, they're tradeoffs often, almost always, I'd say.
>
> “But what about something with lust? How does that reflect back?”; So use the principle of straightforwardness. If you're lusty, you get the consequences of being lusty. What are the consequences of that? You may cheat on your SO. If you want more sex than your SO, you may start pestering your SO. When you want to relax, lust may kick in and derail your attempt at relaxation, causing you to chase sex when you'd ordinarily rather do something more leisurely and less stressful (assuming you find looking for sex stressful, which I think is fair to say for most people it probably is). Or say you're working on an important project, and an attractive human appears. Suddenly you can't focus, if you're lusty. Etc. Lust can lead to accidental children. All these are simple and straightforward consequences of lust. So you're not going to a

> cartoonish fiery hell, and you're not wasting some secret energy in your testicles or ovaries, and you're not just from lust alone going to be reborn as an animal. Etc. All that is bullshit.]]

Good response. However, you may well be going to a "cartoonish fiery hell" - because it's not just only about the triggering by intention (the part of reality you shifted) it's about what that implies in terms of world-as-defined-so-far.

Having already implicitly intended that the existence of a cartoonish fiery hell, it is in fact there waiting for you right now, its hand-drawn flames licking at the edges of your future cel-f.

> >You can achieve such a state, but the requirements are too high for mere mortals.

Yeah, but OP won't be (apparently) mortal forever, is what I'm saying... and by implication he might already have created his "cartoonish fiery hell" as the *next-moment* beyond his last *this-moment* in the set of "plausible moments of being a person". Ouch.

I don't think you need to deliberately decide. If you run out of plausible human trajectory you might have "the experience of dying" and then end up somewhere else. Just as OP confuses himself with being a "human" now, he might confuse himself with being a "something-else" later. Something in a very hot place where people carry forks.

I was discounting the idea of rebirth here. I was suggesting that experience *of some sort* always continues. And if you've already thought a lot about it being a hell-type situation, then that's what you'll get. Like opening a door and there being a landscape beyond. It's not a conscious selection at the moment, it is *creation-by-implication*. OP is going to a big cartoonish fiery pit of doom, because at some level he has implied its existence. *Sizzle!*

> >And this is rebirth, with which I agree.

I prefer to say that "experience continues" because it's not burdened with any assumptions about reappearing as a human restart on this planet (which implies a persistent place with a persistent timeline or history).

> >If this were true, then just thinking about psychic powers would get you functional psychic powers. That isn't how it works.

The difference between our hell situation and psychic powers is that in the latter case, the gap is already filled. You already have that part of the landscape filled up. In the case of the post-death scenario, we're dealing with pure creation-by-expectation to fill the gap.And why do you think that thinking about psychic powers can't get you functional psychic powers? What if you thought *an awful lot* about them?

> >I am saying humans generally remain humans indefinitely unless something interesting happens

Why do you think this?

I do *not* think we become an animal or whatever. I don't believe that the human lifetime plays out as a timeline, even, and that it contributes to some development of state. If you are in a car crash, you are just as

likely to suddenly not have had the crash, or to wake up at home in bed from "a dream about a car crash", as you are to be "reincarnated".

Your person-experience is within and of your conscious perspective. It is not something you are. You are not bound to it in some biological karmic way.

Which actually means you are *more* likely to end up in hell than if you were in a Christian or Buddhist type world.

> >Thinking-about doesn't produce sufficient intent.

How true. But where there's a *will* there's a way, and *thinking-about* is a nice way to make yourself aware of specifications, for the fun. But the *will* is as much about clearing out opposition than anything else. There is no opposition lying in wait when you hit an experiential end-point. The *next-moment* will happily provide itself. So the comparison is not valid (between post-death-moments and psychic-thinking).

On time (as experienced, not as a larger context since that doesn't exist), let us for convenience declare it to be all present. It is not true *now* that I am F&BH *then*, but it might be true *later* that I am in F&BH *then*.

> >Rebirth is even moment to moment, breath to breath.

Well that can get all a bit picky. Let us declare each moment "fresh" in that case.

> >Secondly, I am saying the general shape of your landscape, and its laws, are not arbitrary.

They are accumulated. You are making my point for me somewhat: that any *next-moment* will be consistent with the structure of the landscape. However, if your landscape includes the concept of a F&BH then it is reachable. It is part of the laws and is not arbitrary.

I am not suggesting that just *anything* will happen next. What happens next will definitely "make sense".

> >But your intent is more profound than just the body. Think: in dreams generally physics remains identical to waking.

Ah, right. You see, I'm not thinking of this stuff to be related to the body at all. The body, thought, the environment, they all arise from-within the "world-pattern" and consistent with it. By which I really mean, the very structuring of yourself. Like the Imagination Room metaphor from before, where the swirling patterns dictate the entirety of experience, which includes body sensations and so on, but everything else.

> >There is no end-point. [experiential end-point]

I agree with this, I was meaning when you run out of a plausible story for the continuance of your *person-in-a-world* experience, so there has to be some sort of discontinuous change (apparently).

For example, you have that car crash, you fly through the window and get diced on the grill of the oncoming truck - the body as conceived of is definitely destroyed in this dream. So, here you are without a body... what experience arises next? What "makes sense" as the next spontaneous arising?

The *next-moment* provide itself as in, the accumulation of observations so far (the patterned state) implies a next experience which arises, even though you don't "deliberately" choose it (by weighing up options).

> Moments tend to resemble each other. For particularly small moments of time it's accurate to say for our current style of mentality that they're more alike than different.

Yes, agreed. When I say "fresh" I just mean we can reconsider each one in our discussion. Each *next-moment* is similar to the last for as long as their is a plausible story from *this-moment*. If not, there is inevitably a discontinuity (apparently). This does just happen randomly though; the *next-moment* will make sense in terms of the broader pattern.

> They're stored in your intent.

Okay, I think we're getting somewhere: you are viewing things a little differently to me. I don't see it as having "my" intent. All intending affects the actual world-pattern. Not "my" world-pattern but the actual world-pattern.

At the very moment of intending, my intention is superimposed upon the actual world. All subsequent experiences will then be in alignment with that modified (really: superposition) world-pattern.

So in physics a superposition of patterns is: pattern1 + pattern2 + pattern3 + pattern4 = Total Pattern

Hence it is both an accumulation and a transformation. There is no sense of separation in the overall pattern. Each addition of a pattern transforms the total pattern.

However, in this example we're not really talking about something that corresponds to your sword metaphor. Because the sword would be a single pattern or intention that was being modified; the patterns I was talking about "superimposing" are different intentions on top of the world (e.g. Nice new hat + meet my friend + sunny on Tuesday = Nice Week).

> World-pattern arises in the mind and nothing arises in the world-pattern.

The world-pattern here is *everything*. You might say that at any moment one particular part of the world-pattern is "lit up" (appears as senses) but it is always there in awareness. Like (reusing an old one) the sun in the daytime sky, where the sun's brightness conceals the other stars that are there. If one could select which star to become "the sun" then that would be apparently evolving sensory experience from a fixed world-pattern.

> Agreed 100%, but what happens after the context bursts is not arbitrary.

We are agreed. One of the points of a world-pattern is that it is a structuring of experience. The *next-moment* always "makes sense". That doesn't mean you can't end up in hell, though, if that is your natural understanding of what happens after you "die". For something to exist in the world-pattern, it merely has to be conceived of. The only difference between a thought of something (a "shadow-sensory" experience) and a dominant sensory experience of it, is intensity.

> Your propensities are "stored" in the mind as your intent, and intent doesn't become destroyed when the context is no longer plausible.

This is what I have been calling a world-pattern. It is both the memory storage *and* that which is experienced. Sensory experience is merely a triggering into the senses of certain patterns within the world-pattern. All

thoughts and observations are therefore already present, either actually or logically (there is no difference, or at least no way to distinguish).

In other words, to jump from humaning and physicaling to F&BH is a task for the best of beings, not for normals.

I'm not suggesting you lose your human-formatting, although you might no longer experience a body (which is fine, human-formatting is about sensory profile not content).

> >In my view there is no "actual" anything. The world has no pattern of its own. In fact, there is no world at all.

Nothing has anything of its own. I'm not talking about a physical, spatially-extended world - I'm talking about that structural pattern which is basically the "definition" of possible experiences. In short, the "world" that you experience.

This is *exactly* subjective idealism. There is no structure outside of this, this is everything: the entirety. It is within you and it is you and so on. It is the constellation. You are the stars. Blah.

Let's just cut to something: Obviously when we are discussing this stuff we both realise that there is no division between context and content, experience and experiencer, and so on. To discuss it is to separate it temporarily into parts; plainly this is not the actual situation.

By naming something we inevitably imply it has a separate existence. This is the problem of thought, which comes to use as a "shadow-sensory" experience. It requires division, relative location, and temporal separation. Conceptualisation inherently means fragmentation of the subjects, when of course it is whole.

> >When I dream I see different world-patterns, but they all share similar rules of physics. So it's possible for world-patterns to change but for the general rules to remain.

The world-pattern contains all worlds. It is the very structuring of your experience - *the world of experience* not "Planet Earth" or "this dream" or "being this person". Strictly speaking it cannot even be referred to as a configuration space. As mentioned previously, it's basically a memory-block. Memories are triggered associatively; new memories overlaid; etc. But any metaphor cannot capture it, for it is all "ideas".

[...]

No, no, no, I don't associate it with effort and struggle! Damn you! ;-)

The apparent division between "on its own" and "intervening" is simply to convey that no ongoing maintenance is required - that one needn't be constantly "doing" your experience - and that you can gently redirect it as desired, occasionally.

Now, in the final limit what is happening of course is that it's all you, you are the ongoing movement and you are the shift in movement. But that's not very visual or useful way to describe it from the outset. Again, it's back to the "there is no division, everything is consciousness" formulations which are of no use other than something to remember as the fundamental.

No struggling for me, kiddo!

Okay, on "optimising for influence", that's exactly what I am pursuing. And I think of it as better to have a situation where experience plays out and one only need occasionally "decide" on what you want the world to be like. Not even "what you want to happen" - rather, what you want the *facts-of-the-world* to be from this point onwards.

Effortless is built in, you can't get away from it, if you're going to take your stand as awareness, rather than as body muscle and tension and resistance. Change *only* happens when you are relaxed or have reached a point of effective relaxation (via balance).

World-pattern is in the sense of your private world. It has nothing to do with planets. It's more properly called, perhaps, your private extended definition of your universe, or similar. However, it's a completely generic arbitrary associative and generative patterning system, so it's more like a memory landscape.

Things sound right as you type them, and then realise it's not quite right, or is a statement too far from what we intended. When we're having a "live" discussion, probably best we draw attention to a revised idea in the next "live" message - just as we would in real-life dialogue?

So, I'm really not getting across what I actually mean with this intending, deciding, happening business - because you are responding with words like "passivity" and so on. The sense in which I mean it is (referencing earlier) a frictionless environment.

If the floor in my house had no friction, I would simply "decide" to go to a room and even the tiny shift in weight distribution brought about by the mere thinking about it, would result in me going there. Just thinking about a location, I would find myself there.

Now, if it takes "time" for the shift from here to there to occur, I could change my mind and - simply by the changing of my mind - end up in a different room instead.

In neither case would we say I was "passive" but nor would I need to "maintain" a particular decision. The fact of the decision would have altered things such that I was going to the room in question.

(Now obviously our metaphor requires a separation into parts which do not exist, but it illustrates the point. With no friction, no inertia, once a destination has been brought into mind, it will remain in mind and be effective, until adjusted again.)

What does the "memory-block" look like? Nothing. Time and space are aspects of particular experiences; time and space are themselves contextual patterns. There is no "outside" to the memory-block and no time. If it changes, the previous state no longer exists and never did. The notion of "pattern" is obviously a concept to describe something that in an of itself has no properties. We might think of them as "dimensionless facts". If you can think about it, it's not it, but we are choosing to think about it.

Take a pause right now, and recall the memory the last time you were at a party (say). Where is that party now? Where was the shadow-sensory image of the party, before you recalled it right now? The best you can probably say is that the memory - like the non-unfolded-sensory world - is a *background feeling*. So the memory-block "looks" like a feeling.

Response

> >In your example you'll spend quite some time drifting through space before you reach your destination, assuming you only used a tiny shift in weight.

Quite so. Just as in real life. If I intend a result, events fall into place over *time* which lead me to my destination. The stronger the shift in weight the shorted that experience would be. All analogies have limits, but that's not a problem. That's what analogies are. You're not trying to capture the whole reality because only the whole reality does that. You're just trying to capture the feel of a certain aspect.

In your analogy, I actually don't understand what you're trying to say. In what way am I at the middle of a hill or the top of a hill? What are the heavy balls? What does deflection mean? It sounds like things are "coming at you" and you are constantly in a battle against circumstances. And that circumstances are separate from you. And that it's possible for something to be "out of reach". And so on. It doesn't present a model of that "the world" is.

But all we're pointing out here is that metaphors *necessarily* draw upon "everyday world" experiences (physical objects in spatial arrangements unfolding over time) and so, quite reasonably, can only capture a part of the whole picture. There will always be a problem with a metaphor; what matters is that the problem is outwith the main property that's being illustrated. This does mean that the complete set of illustrative metaphors do inevitably clash; just like the physical theories of today.

> >In practice you can have 10% of your mind agreeing and 90% disagreeing, because it's easy thanks to habit and other factors to keep the old patterns. You have to convince all of your mind to get on board

This kind anthropomorphises "mind" which is really just a structure, but I agree with the idea overall - one might call it "coherence" or something like that: the clarity of the mind really.

> >I get this, but there is no analogy for this. This is a unique feature of the mind for which there is no analogy.

Yeah, it's unexplainable as an entirety, only aspects of it. However, "remembering" is something most people have had an experience of, and have a mental model of, so it's quite a valuable approach.

> >should be explained straightforwardly.

There's no such thing. There is *only* metaphors. No matter how you try to explain something, if you are doing it in terms of something else (which you must do if you are explaining a new concept to someone), then you are using a metaphor.

> >OK. Just do me a favor and don't use the word "pattern" for something that has no shape. If it's a pattern it has a shape. Patterns are recognizable and are identifiable.

What is the shape of a memory-pattern?

Back to Basics?

1. A Return To Here

But all this, this metaphoring, is simply more imagination on top of the already-imagined. The risk is that we are making things far more complicated than they need to be, for not a lot of additional benefit - practically speaking, but perhaps also in terms of understanding.

So let us return one again to our immediate experience: the current single sensory *state* in awareness. (We've been calling them experiences or moments and so on, but the word "state" gets to it. What is *true* is this state, now. Note that by "sensory" I don't just mean visual-auditory-texture, but the whole sense of being-in-a-state too.)

- Every moment brings a new state, the incorporation of an additional fact, which persists unless amended. Isn't that all that's ever happening?
- The changing of the state *is* what we call the passage of time, *if* a residue of the previous state is incorporated into the new state. (This is not necessarily the case.)
- We direct our experience by imagining occasionally - creating additional "facts" - but most people do this in *reaction* to appearances (the facts so far) and within the limitations they suggest.
- The Insight Of The Oneironaut™ is that you can create any state you want by imagining new facts, *now*, without limitation. What you *see-now*, and what you *think-now* that you have seen "previously", don't necessarily matter.

2. Further Discussion

However (and this does maybe tie into what you are trying to say with your "ongoing intention", which I don't think we clash on) - if you are holding onto a particular fact then that remains part of the state even as the rest of it changes.

For instance, *time and continuity* are ideas, albeit ones that are not seen-heard-touched. For as long as those ideas are active, they are part of the imagining you make, the continue as part of the state. If you change the body from a seated to a standing position, but hold onto the muscles in your hips, you either end up rising slowly (best case) or will end up in a half-seated half standing position (worst case). This is a bit like your "10% of your mind agreeing and 90% disagreeing", perhaps?

Then:

- To make massive changes, then, you must detach almost completely, to allow the whole state to be reimagined or reseeded. You basically need to "stop thinking about" other stuff.
- Every thought or metaphor we come up with, is simply *further structuring* our actual experience. We are basically creating more observations, more partial facts.
- So... is the best approach not simply to *imagine that* there is only this current sensory fact, with nothing at all behind it, and no mechanisms? Even contemplating "how intention works" simply hobbles the simplicity of it.

Returning to a quote we were playing with a while ago:

"However you imagine that it works,
That's how it works." -- The rule of metaphor

In other words, when we create metaphors we are not thinking *about* things exactly; we are thinking those metaphors into actual existence. When we *imagine* something in the 3rd-person, we are literally creating a model (like: painting a new picture). If, in addition, while we are doing this we *imagine that* it is how the world works, then we are making the world work that way (like: re-painting *this* picture).

We might consider "this world" is be a painting we are focused upon. In error, when people use their creative power, they usually create or amend other paintings to the side, rather than making alterations to "this world". They keep making more and more paintings "about" this world, in the hope that this will alter this world. But unless they declare equivalence (which is what magick does) it only has partial effect.

> [Your conical hill metaphor]

This seems to imply an idea of a "momentum" and some sense of "proximity", neither of which I'm keen on. But probably the root of it is: I'm perhaps not talking about a "universe" in the same sense you are, maybe (see later). Return to that later though.

To clarify now, just so I've got a better idea of what you are actually meaning, rather than just what I *suppose* you are meaning:

What does it mean, for a ball to roll to the other side of the hill?
What does it mean, for phenomena to have "steam"?
What is this "steam"?
What *is* the starting point for a phenomenon?
What do you mean by "originate unconsciously"?

> >The problem is when you use an analogy and don't specify what you're trying to illustrate and where the limits lie.

I think you have just illustrated this! ;-)

> >We don't ever even want to try to describe something ultimate.

It can't be done because it is: a) not divided into parts and can't be conceptualised, b) any conceptualisation happens *within* the ultimate.

I think we *do* know all truth, right now. Know it and directly experience it. That is different to experiencing the "unpacked" aspects of it, however. Right now, the world is within you but you-as-persepective are not experiencing all possible viewpoints visually, of instance.

> >Ultimate truth is a truth about other truths. It's meta in level, and is not usable directly by itself.

A good statement. Saying "everything is and is made of consciousness" *implies* certain approaches, but in and of itself it says nothing. Like "everything is one" and "all is illusion". Okay great.

> >The reason I said that is because you've been using world-pattern a few times not to mean something with shape, but to convey something shapeless. That's confusing.

It does have "shape" however it is not a shape in terms of spatial extent or a visual shape. The word "form" could perhaps be used instead; a non-sensory form.

The issue here is that our descriptions and metaphors *require* a shadow-sensory experience - we think my creating shadow-worlds with shadow-objects and relating them. Since this is the thing *before* even that, it's obviously pretty difficult to describe!

Was watching some videos lately (pondering my other interest of physics metaphors) and Larry Susskind in a talk put up a slide of an interference pattern of a hologram (basically, the incomprehensible swirly pattern which when illuminated by appropriate light results in particular images).

It is essentially information dissolved into the background. You might say we experience it subtly as an imperceptible "global feel" normally, and when we go "illuminating" we experience the unfolded image.

> >As soon as I gave the metaphor I also criticized it soon after.

Uh-huh, I'm agreeing here by thinking aloud, not picking new things. Okay, so proceeding from your other responses, you are "cutting up" experience a little differently to me. For instance, there can be no "Other" since everything is "here"; what you call "steam" is just more established pathways; but the root ideas are probably the same. More important though: You seem to be viewing *not doing something* as "intentional". Isn't this a bit superfluous? I'm never "not doing" anything. Experience arises, I might interfere, but if I don't then I'm not "not-intefering".

> >It means you relate to origination as something outside your subjective sphere. Since it's "out there" it can only be unconscious.

What can there possibly be, outside my "subjective sphere"? It's not enclosed - so no sphere no "outside". Isn't that fundamental to subjective idealism?

> >To say that the ultimate is not divided into parts is already a grievous error.

How can the ultimate be divided into parts, fundamentally? It can be *conceived of* as being divided into parts, however even that conceptualisation will be of whole cloth, a *fiction* of division.

> >A form is something with an outline. If it has no outline, it's not a form.

The distinction to make is between something as experienced and something as it is "in itself". For example, a triangle definitely has a form, right? Here is a triangle: image and here is a triangle: {(1,2,1), (5, 5, 5), (10,2,5)}



>So you're saying "it's out there." I can't agree. :)

No, everything is "in here", or actually neither inside nor outside because there is neither. :-P

To return to an analogy you've used: the fish not knowing what water is. A problem with conceiving of our situation is that we are not like the fish; we are not "in" anything. It's more like *water* not knowing what water is.

> >So for example, if I select a big red six sided die, that preference is not stored in the bag, so can't be in there.

Both the choice and the bag exist (as far as they "exist") inside you. For fun, we sometimes call an object with us "me" and pretend that it does things like looking at options and making choices, but really that is all just play-acting. All of that sits at the same level.

> >Are you aware of non-implicative negations? And the only way to be free from error is to become familiar with many many many errors

Not this, not that. The term is new to me though; I like it. So really the only way to become free from error is to... step back and realise that errors are just like everything else. We might decide to do this or we might be driven to it by sheer exhaustion.

> >[No, everything is "in here"] Not everything. :) You aren't here.

Haha, well of course I'm the only thing (which isn't a thing) which isn't anywhere at all (and yet is everywhere). And so on.

> >That's still not everything. Where is my next choice?

As soon as you have thought of it, it is there also. The thought of it *is* it. Until you have thought of it, you don't even know you don't know (so to speak).

> >We take an object that's with us, and we split it into me and not-me. But all that is arbitrary. Both me-ness and not-meness are mental fabrications.

Yes, they are fabrications. Are you suggesting, though, that these objects which your are identifying with, were not created by you? And that you could not create another object now, and identify with it?

> >The study of the world and of oneself is literally the study of error.

Do we need to study the error, other than for interest and amusement? Can we not simply identify with the background (as it were, knowingly the mistake) and view all identification as "error"?

> >Where is it before I have thought of it?

Until you have experienced it ("observed" it) there is no such thing, except as *implied by* previous experiences. However even contemplating the implication brings about the observation. You can retrospectively *imagine that* it was there all along. It's actually pretty claustrophobic. You can't see around the edge, as it were. You

can't catch sight of the pre-sight situation - because there is not one. You can only conceive "that there is one" (which is really to say that *there will be* one).

> >Slow changes are easier. One-offs are easier than repeatable functions. Shallow changes are easier.

Let's return to that. "Why" is this so?

> >This kind of lazy heuristic is no substitute for the actual wisdom.

But if the "actual wisdom" is wisdom of a relative sort - one part of the world experience as contrasted with or implied by another - then what fundamental value does it have?

If wisdom is content then I can change the world within me and make it obsolete. I am the *constructor* of wisdom, then; wisdom is an *experience* which arises within me (a "me" which is before structured knowledge, being simply "being").

> >If something is non-existent, how can I think of a concept that doesn't exist?

You can think of the *existence* of something. For instance, you can think of the train having a driver without thinking of a *specific* driver.

I agree with all the rest of it, that's my thinking also.]

Fundamentally, you just can't get "outside" of your *thinking-about*, you can't be further along the road than you actually are until you get there. We can conceive of the fact of their *being a place* for something - slots in which things should appear - ahead of the encountering, but we are just thinking stuff.

> >You can know the teleology of your will.

As you say. As to "decisioning" there's a case of describing all "observations" as happenings because it gets rid of a load of dubious abstractions - for starters, it means we get away from the idea of there being persistent things that are "occurring" in some defined way when not being observed - but we've implicitly covered that.

> >So slow changes are easier than quick ones because I enjoy stability at all times...

The discomfort of discontinuity! I think everyone has this. Anything is possible, but the implications actually acting upon this can break your reality quite badly.

For instance, a friend dies in an accident. You summon that fact from the background and you change it. You go to the bar that night and he's there as if nothing happened (which, now, has become true). How does that *really* work out for you?

Even much less dramatic alterations bring with them certain "existential issues". If you've lost your wallet in the park and you update the world so that it's now lying on the table, you can explain it away as having teleported it, or a friendly spirit having moved it, or forgetfulness (the "urge to forget" is very strong after significant shifts) or whatever. So long as you don't think too deeply about it.

> I believe there are beings not in this realm here that don't have a discomfort around discontinuity.

What beings could there be that aren't of this realm? Surely there's just... me. ;-)

> However, at high levels of renunciation, "breaking" what sucks or what one no longer cares for is no longer a big deal.

Many of the dramatic stories people have of discontinuous change occur in times of desperation: imminent death, life gone truly wrong.

Interestingly, people often report odd and flexible realities when a child: wishing they were staying at their grandparents' and waking up there; needing to go to the toilet and 'blink-teleporting' to the bathroom; people and things suddenly changing, appearing, disappearing.

Children have less of an investment in stability; correspondingly, their magick may come more easily. *Ctrl-C, Ctrl-V* (duplicating toys), *Ctrl-Z* (undoing events), etc.

> The friend dying.

This links back to our other conversation about observations and so on. So for the purposes of this, I propose that observations are always consistent with previous observations, facts accumulate and the world becomes increasingly stable; the world always "makes sense".

If you make discontinuous change ("my friend is still alive") then *from that moment on* your observations will be consistent with that updated fact. There will be no evidence other than your memory that it was ever different to this, since any "looking for evidence" would of course be an "observation" subsequent to the change.

Now matter how it plays out, each observation will be plausible, and narrow the possibilities of the next observation:

- You are drinking in the bar. The friend shows up. He never had an accident and there's no evidence of an accident, and nobody remembers the accident or your previous conversations about one, *or*
- You are drinking in the bar. The friend shows up. He had been fucking with everyone with a Facebook post and it just got out of hand, *or*
- You are drinking in the bar. You have a conversation with the barman and talk about the friend's death, the barman says "yeah I heard". The friend shows up. Turns out his *brother* had a crash and the reports got confused, *or*...

Depending on what you do and how it plays out, you are getting what you want, but the "story" that goes with it may vary according to your demands.

I *am* the formless realm. ;-)

Yeah, there are lots of interesting stories about distant places and what you might term a lower "consensus hurdle" to change, although I'm inclined to say that it isn't a real barrier so much as a barrier that ends up being formed within you. For example, many who go on meditation retreats report that after a while their

dreams seem to be more solid and real than their waking time. The "rigidity" of their waking life seems to dissolve somewhat.The traditional view has been that consensus is enforced by contribution, but don't think that's necessarily so.

Hallucinations are just more experiences and are equally valid. They aren't "wrong". Right? :-)

> [Facts accumulate] They seem to, but they don't. All of one's expectations is one single expectation. Nothing accumulates.

For sure it's just a way of describing the process. There is indeed one single fact and it shifts (although not in time). When I was talking of a "world-pattern" previously, it is to this "one single fact" that I was referring.

You are calling this "expectation" but that implies an anticipation, which I dislike. It is better to say something like "fact" - but remembering that "fact" also means how things work, the formatting or framework, not just specific locations and properties of "things" and such.

>So knowledge cannot really accumulate.

The above should clear this up - accumulation would be the "apparent process" however the truth is something more like a shifting state.

>The problem is, depending on how the story goes, you may feel like you don't deserve any credit for doing magick. ;)

Haha! Well, it may actually be the default that you don't retain the memory of the change. If the "one single fact" moves and doesn't leave you with any personal trace of the prior state, then your friend never died *and* you never brought him back. (Confusing histories!)

Additional: Just in passing, on the consensus thing, I was reminded of this story:

Consensus Reality
Aboard an oceanographic ship in the Persian Gulf

While I was stationed on a ship in the Persian Gulf during the war, I had the experience of being "out-voted" about the correct syntax of a computer command which I knew functioned perfectly well just the day before.

A group of less well-informed technicians wandered by, and shared their consensus opinion that I could not possibly get the output I expected using that computer command. Lo and behold, they were right; from that point on, I never could get that syntax to work again. I have come to believe that reality is based on consensus. Proximity is probably relevant, and degree of belief/influence may vary for participants. I suspect that our long isolation as a group may have played a part in that event.

-- Yedeth, Your Stories Page 23, Realityshifters.com

[...]

>All you have to do, is wait, and new things show up. But that's not necessarily true.

This is exactly true, in experience! The *next-step* of the world always "makes sense" in terms of the previous observations. However, it is not *predictable*. Mainly because it is *the world of reality* (the entirety of all subtleties) that imply the next step. You cannot anticipate this or model it, because those things are *in* it.

>All experience is directional. You can't stop directing it.

I dislike the use of "directional" because it implies a destination. I dislike the use of "directing" because it implies an act. However, the meaning is understood.

>Simplicity is not a virtue in and of itself. I oppose gratuitous complexity.

We are agreed.

>So a physicalist metaphor does what now?

All metaphors are essentially physicalist, in a way.

>The world changes constantly in boring, uninteresting ways.

Maybe *your* world does; my world is far more fascinating. ;-)

>I use the language of personal responsibility.

But who is this "person" and what exactly are they "responsible" for?

>We can draw metaphors from family relations, or taste, and those aren't physicalist.

Actually, my real point was that all metaphors will be *object-based* within a context of location (space) and transformation (time). We are bound to imagine "parallel mini-worlds of surface" while considering ourselves to be probing something deeper or behinds things (which we are not).

>What is the location and transformation of 1+1=2?

Think of it now. What do you experience?

For me, I have a parallel sort of blank space which is simultaneous with sensory experience, and in the area which would correspond to just outside the location of the left side of my jaw, there's a white blurry hand-written script (like this).



If I attend to this, I see that just beyond it is a sort of grid, like this but in a triangular shape, with the sides being of lengths 1, 1, and 2. I do not deliberately construct any of this, it's just what appears.

Note that this is not a *representation* of the sum in my mind, it *is actually* that sum in my mind as it is currently. (From experience, if I change these "objects" then the change persists or evolves from the new state.)

> >I experience a sense of equivalence, is perhaps the best way I can describe it.

Would you say that was a "feeling"? A sort of *felt-sense* of the situation from which any other shadow-sensory aspects arise? I think of them as all of a piece. The form may indeed change depending on context but the "essence" of it is the same. (For the particular example, mine is quite stable though.)

What do we mean by "abstract" anyway? Perhaps we can approach this by example.

The Vase

I have never seen a vase before. A vase is on the table. I move around the vase, seeing it from different angles. I pick up the vase, feel it. I then use the vase, filling it with water and putting flowers in it. While doing so, a friend tells me where she bought the vase with her mother. Later that day, we go to the shop and see lots of different vases. In the evening, I watch a TV show about how vases are made.

So, what is "a vase"? It is the summation of all those different vase-related sensory experiences. It is no particular instance of those experiences; it is the overall pattern produced by the accumulation of those experiences [1] - including the auditory-visual language, "a vase".

When I say to myself, "a vase", I have a *felt-sense* that *comes-with* some other sensory aspects which appear in awareness. So it's abstract in the sense of not being "about" a specific vase, but in terms of being an experience it *is* quite specific.

[1] Berkeley has a term for this which I can't find at the moment: maybe something like "collection" or "occasions". In any case, all the sensory experiences of something that lead to it being distinguished and hence to the formation of it as "a thing".

> >I like the term felt-sense. I hesitate to call it a feeling. Maybe intuition is a better term.

I shy away from "intuition" because it's vague in use whereas *felt-sense* nicely captures the idea of *felt-meaning* and *direct-knowing*. It can be used to indicate what exactly intuition *is* in terms of an experience. And as you say, "feeling" means other things.

> >If you take it to be a summation, then so long as you are missing something from your summation, you don't know what the vase is.

You never know *all about* "vase" (potentially speaking) because there is are always more vase-experiences to come. Although you do know "all that a vase is so far". What vase "is" to you is the summation-pattern, the observation-accumulation, of all your vase-experiences so far.

In the example, after the visit to the shop I have a pretty good "abstract vase". I could certainly identify things as vases and so on. But *then* I watch the TV show about how vases are made, and my "abstract vase" has changed again, been further enriched. When I encounter a vase, *all of this* is triggered into experience a as a *felt-sense*. What a vase "is" to me, is that *felt-sense*.

How would *you* describe what a vase "is"?

> >[On intuition as a word] I like it because it's vague.

I meant "vague" in the sense of it has lots of different meanings to different people, whereas with *felt-sense* we mean something which, although it cannot be specified in language, does have a particular meaning and context. The *content* of it may be vague, but the phenomenon itself is not. Anyway, *felt-sense* is the best term I've encountered for capturing that "direct global knowing of all aspects" of something (the quoted phrase itself already goes off!).

> >Either there is no concept of a vase then, since the summation is never finished.

You're not gonna get all "Platonic" on me, are you? There is *no* "vase" separate from the accumulated observations that contribute to "vase".

> >You're also assuming all your experience with the vase is acceptable and is not a corruption/lie/misinformation.

But how to judge that? *All* vase-related experiences add to my "abstract vase" and all are genuinely vase-related. If I subsequently encounter a vase-related experience which negates a previous one, then my "abstract vase" is adjusted accordingly. "Vase" is an ongoing thing. Just like the world.

From a subjective idealist point of view, the world *is* my accumulated observations of it. There is no truth other than this, "somewhere else". Observations include sensations, perceptions, thoughts - everything that arises in the space of awareness.

This is vital. Because this is how we can make changes. We do so by *creating additional observations* which constitute the latest *facts-of-the-world*.

> >I'd describe it as ignorance without any basis in either experience or ultimate reality, an arbitrary mental fabrication.

It's basis is *entirely* in experience *and* mental fabrication (which is just more experience) *and also* it is a form of the ultimate reality.

> >We use a reality validation framework for this.

I'd make the point that we are not *deliberately* working out what constitutes "vase" and what does not. I'd don't do any deliberate checking and cross-checking. Simply by encountering "vase"-related experiences my "abstract vase" is triggered and modified. Such experiences include conversations *about* vases and so on. When I say "observations" I mean in the broadest sense: any experience that connects in some way to my "abstract vase" will revise it.

Because there is no separation between vase-experiences and my abstract-vase. My "comprehension" of the experience involves the triggering of my abstract-vase.

> >Instead there is one expectation which has a certain conceptual "shape" to it. When you learn new info, you update your expectation. So expectation changes shape, so to speak, but it doesn't change in quantity. It changes in quality only.

This sounds very similar to what I am saying though, does it not? Perhaps I need to be clearer: by "observation accumulation" I mean that the arising of experiences inherently evolve knowledge. As in the vase example above.

> >[On "creating observations" and magick] This is bad for magick.

I disagree, but remember that by "observation" I am including all experiences. To say observations are non-factual is the same as saying all observations *are* factual, *in the context that the observation takes place*. By creating new observations, I am pointing to things like: Waving a magic wand having decided that waving the magic wand *means that* the weather will change - i.e. that wand-waving is a *fact* of weather-changing. Or by imagining that it is raining I am *observing* the fact of future raining. No story required. But this is getting into a language tangle that is not really required. The general sense is that every observation is information about the world, and that creating an observation with different information is to change the world.

> >All experience is a mental fabrication.

You need to remove the word "mental" from that because it's meaningless.

Reply to “My experience of "Just Decide"”

> >I'm actually just imagining that I'm not using efforts to do things.

How will you be able to tell whether you are "actually" not using effort or you are "just imagining" not using effort, if the experience is identical? :-)

Something to ponder: What if one time you allowed your body to rise up and then... never interfered with it ever again? Just allowed it to respond spontaneously with/as the enviromment as it unfolds?

For instance, the "catching exercise" is fun - having decided you are going to catch things, you let your body go and have a friend throw stuff at you, and find you catch it in efficient and unexpected ways. But what if that was always how it was? Your body automatically responding like that without the Decison-Prep? Someone throws something, your body just effortlessly catches it. A guy on a bike skids in front of you unexpectedly, your body sidesteps to avoid collision spontaneously.

That's the eventual outcome: ***One Decision To Rule Them All!***

As you have anticipated, the realisation is that the "the only thing I'm trying to do is hold back these impulses", and that the final decision is to simply allow what is always trying to happen anyway. To get out of the way. That's something to aspire to eventually.

This actually has the greatest potential benefit for speed and accuracy tasks, but the extent to which you need to be "the observer" is greatly increased. Think the knife trick in *Aliens* or more likely: playing sport or threading a needle. Video games are great for practice.

> >The more I let go the more fear I feel, and the more fear I feel the more faith I need to give myself.

Yes indeed, identifying with the awareness-space is the way forward. And it is an interesting thing, this matter of "faith". In some ways, it end up being that the faith is to *not stop* and so therefore you avoid having to *restart* again.

Both the "letting happen" and the sense of expanded space can bring with them a sense of vulnerability and exposure, but once committed to it's actually very secure and freeing.

> >For me, the experience might eventually go away. At least, that's been my experience with many mental "hacks" so far.

Only if you re-trigger the previous experience by thinking about it or returning to it as your starting point. There can be a temptation sometimes to start from the beginning. You discover a way to do something, but you keep bringing to mind the *old way* in order to recall the *new way*. This reasserts the old position!

For example, when we stand up from a chair we can do so by summoning the sensory-image of ourselves standing, and just allowing the body to rise. However, if we do so by imaging our initial sitting position first and *then* the standing position, we effectively reset ourselves. We are intending both positions at once.

Anyway, something to watch out for. This is what "releasing" into the desired state is all about. You have to resist the urge to check you are not in the old state, how far you have progressed from the old state, or even *that there is* an old state.

Feeling writerly this morning after my coffee. So, a little thought experiment (almost literally), based on a metaphor I've used elsewhere:

The Imagination Room Revisited

Something you might find useful as a rule of thumb, is to think of your experience as *literally* a responsive dream-space: the world around you is just a habitual *thought*. The room you are in is a *strong habit* - a imaginary scene that has condensed such that the *thought-of-being-in-this-location* triggers this thought-room. The bodily experience you have is similarly an accumulation of thoughts or "imaginings".

Imagine for a moment that if you sat in a chair and *imagined-that* there was a vase on the table in front of you, unwaveringly, it would eventually solidify into persistence in front of you. If you didn't go the full distance, what instead would happen is that a vase would appear in your life that would *seem to come* via events in the world. However, since there is no persistent spatially-extended world outside your current experience, that is only an apparently true. All that there ever is, is this "imagination space" the contents of which are shifting and changing "as if" you are a body in a world. You never go anywhere, you are never located anywhere.

Adopting this view, what does it mean to stand up?

It means to change the "shape" of the imagination space from "the experience of sitting down" to "the experience of standing up". And since you *are* the imagination space, what you are doing is *shape-shifting yourself*. The change is made by shifting *this* 3D-sensory-thought to *that* 3D-sensory-thought.

So you can see why you shouldn't "look back" and think about where you were - because that means you are shifting back into the previous state, using the exact mechanism of change! And any habitual is more easily "triggered" by partial thinking in this way, so you are most vulnerable to that when trying to shift away from the habitual.

Let the movement of your imagination destroy the place from which you came, and don't be like Lot's wife!

> By the time Lot reached Zoar, the sun had risen over the land. Then the Lord rained down burning sulfur on Sodom and Gomorrah—from the Lord out of the heavens. Thus he overthrew those cities and the entire plain, destroying all those living in the cities—and also the vegetation in the land. But Lot’s wife **looked back**, and she became a pillar of salt.
>
> *-- Genesis 19 -* : *"To regard, to consider, to pay attention to"*

(Yeah I am not remotely religious, but some of the parables are obviously tales with reference to this stuff. The rest of that chapter has a few interesting things to say about creation too. If you read them literally, it's a sorry tale of incest! But actually it's probably describing something like creation-from-self-imagination.)

A Personal Addressable Voxel-Space

Another way to envisage this is a voxel space. Basically, imagine a complete and total void with not even space. Now, imagine a 3-dimensional array of cubes going on forever. Each cube can contain a sensory "pixel" (visual, auditory, texture, feeling). The room you are in now is basically a particular sensory pattern existing in that array.

If you think a thought, that appears in the same voxel-space, only less intense and less stable. However, it leaves a trace upon the space, a slight deformation, however subtle - which results in a momentum from the current state towards the state described or *defined* by the thought. If you are completely detached (is in, not "persisting" other patterns) then the transition between states is effortless and clean. Otherwise, what occurs is a mangling between the present state and the thought, and any other thoughts you are holding onto or resisting.

So when you "look back" you are literally re-defining the target of the voxel-space to your previous state again. That's why lots of "manifestation" type techniques recommend "letting go of your desire". Not because you need to forget what you are after, but because our tendency is to re-created the "state of desiring" when we think about it.

So one interpretation of the "pillar of salt" fits in quite nicely. Earlier in the story:

> Another Jewish legend says that because Lot's wife sinned with salt, she was punished with salt. On the night the two angels visited Lot, he requested of his wife to prepare a feast for them. Not having any salt, Lot's wife asked of her neighbors for salt which so happened to alert them of the presence of their guests, resulting in the mob action that endangered Lot's family.
>
> -- *Jewish commentaries on Lot's wife*, Wikipedia

So, as with other parables such as *The Parable of the Unjust Steward*, this is about forgiveness. And forgiveness in the deeper sense of the word: to forget completely. Lot's wife had made an error relating to salt. By looking back she remained bound to that, she became once again her error - in the same way as when you look back at a habit, you are returned to that state.

Yes, it fits nicely. Also, here's a related essay which is worth a look:

> For it is magic, this pruning shears of revision. It really is not only the achievement of objectives, but if you do it daily, it will awaken in you the spirit of Jesus, which is continual forgiveness of sin. In this teaching the sinner should always go free; you will never condemn him, for when the spirit is awake in you you will realize in him there is no condemnation, only forgiveness, and forgiveness is not as man of the world thinks when he omits the actual execution of his revenge.
>
> -- *The Pruning Shears of Revision*, Neville Goddard

(Assuming you haven't already encountered him.) Goddard was a New Thought guy who interpreted the parables of the Bible as offering insight and instruction on how reality actually worked. His language is a bit old-style, but his concept of the "pruning shears" corresponds to recalling and "editing" the past so that it no longer participates in the ongoing moment - i.e. total forgiveness.

It's worth checking out his book *The Law and the Promise* and other materials. You'll see how the "technique" of it corresponds well to the subjective idealist's concept of a "private view" of the world which is mutable.

Reply to “Seems relevant and applicable.”

I think that when we let go (stop micromanaging) actually a lot of life realigns.

For instance, we may be slogging through the fakery of keeping a face, we decide to give up on that - and then things seem to shift so that it's not required anymore anyway. There's something about taking an approach implying the (apparent) requirement for that approach. And the only way out is to... cease taking that approach. Being nice is 50% a trial but being "whatever you are" is never a trail, but somehow removes the requirement to be deliberately nice.

I am not a fan of up-to-date papers, let us say. And I often find that if I don't do something that I'm meant to do, it turns out not to have mattered anyway. (Although *avoidance* doesn't work in this way, I suppose because avoidance implies that one should be doing it and that there are repercussions.)

If life is literally *this imagination space*, this immersive strand of thought, then of course it has no "depth" and is an ongoing response to our approach *at this moment* regardless of any supposed history. Trying to live an ordinary life would actually be *contrary* to how things are, in that case.

> >I really detest humans so much these days. There are about 100 or 1000 humans I like, but on the whole I detest them. I don't give a fuck. Let them help themselves, I suppose. That's my mood recently.

I’ve been through phases like that. For me anyway, the people I actually know were fine in my mind, but anyone who was “abstract” were pretty much lumped into my sense of things more generally at the time. (That’s how it was for me anyway.) It felt like I’d burned myself out with the effort of, I dunno, feeling responsible - and instead just letting go of that obligation, I swung the other way. It was the *concept* of people at large I was feeling obligated to, and that’s a helluva burden.

> >I will meanwhile save myself, because I sure as fuck know, nobody gives a fuck about me, except maybe my parents and wife, which is sad, but that's the truth.

I’m sure that’s not true. Well, in fact I know it’s not true. But it’s a case of who matters, right? Those people matter.

> >I mean, I hardly ever seen anyone give a fuck about anyone else, except one or two people.

Well, it does seem that there’s a lot of self-absorption around as we go about our day. Particularly at the moment, where society seems to be set up more like a “fight”. But, you have to be sure to separate out your “fictional idea beyond immediate perception”, right? Because it has a sneaky habit of filtering the information that arrives to us, further supporting our view. It’s like: never believe your senses, never believe your thoughts, never believe your beliefs. Or something.

> >So I said, fuck it. I give up. You win. I will be that way too. I need to save myself first, and so fuck you all. . . Being whoever I am is not that easy considering how much filtering and censoring I'd have done in the past.

The next step though is to give up... even that, right? Yeah, all the debris we accumulate can make things pretty difficult.

> >[Things turning out not to matter]]LOL, I find that's true most of the time. Maybe I can even say it's been true every time in the past. But I still have this nagging sense of... what if I need this paper?

Yeah, it's the faith thing! But as our "mind-roominess" grows then that stuff just gets better and better, and the apparent world seems to shift to match and accommodate us. Quite often other people are the sign of this. When you have shifts in mood, they respond. When you feel more open, you are open to them and they are drawn to you. For instance, a few years ago I had a bout of depression, and came out of it. I knew I was coming out of it not because of how I was feeling though - it was that in cafes and out in the town, random people would come up to me and start chatting away, in a way that never happened before. They'd just start talking unprompted about relevant topics, without preamble. They were basically taking on the role of my own inner voice, which had gone quiet, externally. Aspects of me.

> >Because it's not normal for people to smile like that when they pass you by, since I am not doing anything to invite that.

It'll happen more and more. The more you surrender and the more unbounded your mind feels, the more *exposed* and defenceless you will feel - but what you will have become open to is a feeling of, I dunno, "the love" or whatever. You'll be in rooms full of strangers and everyone will be your friend.

> >[On avoidance.] See, it's not all clean like that. I don't get how anyone can ever be perfectly clean about any of their intentions unless you've been living a certain lifestyle for a long time.

For sure. Or rather, it's not about the lifestyle so much as when you reach the stage where you surrender your own micromanagement and let it all start flowing? But it's natural to be in a mixed state with overlapping and contrasting intentions contributing simultaneously.

> >I think the amount of historicity really depends on how you operate your mind. Maybe for you there is very little, but for me there is quite a bit still.

Natural development over time, I'd say.

Eventually you "operate your mind" less and less, and it's more like (as discussed in previous posts and our lucid dreaming pal) *recalling* states that already exist than creating by control. To shift from one 3D-immersive thought to another, you allow the previous one to dissolve as your attention moves to the replacement. That kind of thing.

> >[On wives and parents and worldviews and presents.]

It can be pretty difficult when we love people and yet they are frustrating, due to their unquestioning worldview. Especially when we see it causing them problems, or that we have to be involved in situations we disagree with conceptually, as a compromise. Although that being okay, or endurable, is a sign that there are things beyond just those ideas, that are more important maybe.

I think parental love is *meant* to be idiotic and primitive - that's how parents have been designed! :-) They can only show it their way, even it's a little outdated. Me, I accept the sentiment that's been "infused into" the objects, even as I absent-mindedly dismiss the object themselves. There's no accounting for taste, eh! :-)

On the point that people only care about a version of us, the "you", that they constructed in their minds, there's no way out of that though, right? Their "version" of you *is* you to them, just as your "version" of you *is* you to you - and will be incorrect, because it too is an aspect. Your parental relationship sounds fairly usual! :-)

>[On society being based on the "fight and struggle" metaphor.]

I absolutely agree there. I'm not sure when things shifted to being "an investment", although the seeds were sewn in the 1980s/90s are part of the deregulation of the finance industry, allowing banks and corporations to include yet more things into a "world as market" frame.

This had led to *everyday people* treating their financial dealings as if they were ruthless players; they ditch their empathy and adopt sociopathic tendencies for their actions in those areas. And it has become totally transparent behaviour to them. Even to the extent that they moan about the actions of investment banks and the fallout, while supporting governmental and personal behaviours which exactly correspond to, and are the reasons for, this situation.

We need only look at the current attitude towards Greece and the moral crusade against it. Greece must be punished, as an example to everyone else, the people must pay. Even thought the details are far less clearcut, it could easily have been Spain or Italy, and they were probably duped somewhat. It is disturbing to look at the misery that will because when you compare the Greek debt to the cost of the bank bailouts, and you see how lacking in compassion we are.

>[On people being drawn to us.]

When you are "communing with glory" then what is being drawn to you isn't people. For that time, everything becomes more "you" and the separation with others dissolved somewhat. You are, um, hanging out with yourself! ;-) So yes, our non-human aspects bring us together, because our non-human aspect is that we are just one thing.

I love the idea of you being both a sweetie *and* a beast - that's how it should be! Although strictly speaking, we *aren't* anything at all until events trigger within us a response of a particular type. And then afterwards, we stop being that too. We might have *ideas about* ourselves which persist, but they are baseless really, right? You are that nonhuman happy-said-sunshine-thing.

>[On surrender and exposure.]

Yeah, by "surrender" I mean to cease to obscure what you are. It means to surrender opposition to your true state; it's not like giving up to other forces. Since there *is* only the force-that-is-you, to surrender simply means to become more accurate in your ways, and hence effortless.

On "exposure", perhaps that's the wrong word. I was reaching for something like "unbounded" or that being the context of everything, without being any one thing. There's "nothing to grab" as you said.

>[Dissolving the historicity.]

The more you do so, the less of a fight things become, the more like an “open mind” you seem to be, as you referred to earlier. That’s what that whole *Overwriting Yourself* was all about of course - relaxing or ceasing to oppose, and then asserting that unencumbered state, taking on the shape of it. The ultimate in agility!

Do you have a, um, vision or clear concept of how you would like to live, the world as you would like it to be? Not defined in terms of a response or manipulation of this one (i.e. not defined as counter or negatively) but as a positive image (not emotionally, but in the sense of being “assertable”)?

Might it be better to talk in terms of not being "identified" rather than "disowning"? The final view would be one where owning or disowning becomes meaningly. It's easier to say that because we are everything, we are not any particular thing - and that this isn't about *content*.

For instance, if changing from this environment to another is simply a case of allowing this to fade and embracing another, it makes no more sense to say we own or identify an environment than it does to say the same of a thought. The world "is" a strand of thought, albeit a bright and stable and immersive one, etc.

[...]

>What I mean is, your ultimate being overwhelms the world. Not the other way around.

Yes, that's it. The world is an ongoing thought within you, you are not an ongoing process within a world.

Reply to “Free Will and Predestination: Your Tyranny as Freedom for Others”

Really been enjoying your post and comments. Your descriptions of the 'ultimate truth' of things is very clear, and that your world is a combination of your intentions-so-far. But also wondering, practically speaking...

> >You can choose to shift into the reality where that is already happening in their intent and in the process of unfolding. . . By implication, you can force it to be the case that someone falls in love with you freely, or becomes lucid freely, or commits suicide freely.

How does one choose or force, in your understanding? Is it enough to simply make the choice, is it a case of 'allowing' it because it is already your intention, or is there something more specific to do?

For example, how would you force someone to become lucid?

> >How do you raise your right hand into the air? If you give the (I think, not quite correct) answer that you tighten and loosen certain muscles, then how do you tighten and loosen those muscles?

I think those who move their arms by "tightening and loosening" are like those who think step-by-step to solve a problem. They are intending through graduation rather than intending the result and allowing.

> >I think that sometimes we have to give ourselves permission (or allow ourselves) to exercise certain intentions, but I think the intention to act is separate from the permission to intend to act.

Hmm. I've previously been unsure about this "choosing your reality all the time" view, but I think in the end it was just a matter of perspective.

- Where there is greater resistance to a direction, one must more deliberately *intend*.
- Where there is minimal resistance to a direction, simply *deciding* is sufficient.
- When there is no resistance to a direction, it is effortless and we are unaware of our creation, because we are simply experiencing our beliefs, manifesting spontaneously.

Because the final one involves no conscious act, as it were, I've shied away from calling it creation, but really it's just terminology. Essentially, all manifestation is a matter of adopting beliefs ("inserting and accepting facts" as I have phrased it) and your experiences will subsequently line up. *Deciding* and *intending* are just the experience of overcoming some belief push-back or doubt associated with a goal. The actual appearance of creations, the manifestation itself, is always effortless. Would you agree?

> >I think the intention to act is separate from the permission to intend to act.

I guess it could have levels. There can be resistance to performing the act at all (resistance to using your power to achieve an outcome) and then the experience of the intention (resistance to the possibility of the desired outcome).

> (Making someone lucid) ...ut to decide that, you need to be aware of what beliefs you are manifesting presently and what options you have instead and what they would feel like...

Yes, this makes sense. Forcing someone to become lucid is actually a matter of allowing yourself to experience then becoming lucid.

I guess this doesn't need to be a two-step process necessarily. If you asset a new fact ("my fist will be clenched") you will get immediate feedback if there is a problem ("already clenched!"), just by doing the assertion and while pushing through it. Resistance might be factual ("already done!") or belief-based ("that's not possible!"), but either way if there is a barrier to dissolve or move through, it is revealed.

[[AesirAnatman: As a matter of preference, I would shift the emphasis from: “Where there is greater resistance to a direction, one must more deliberately *intend*.” to: **Where there is greater resistance to a direction, one must more *deliberately* intend**.]]

Agreed on the change of emphasis, since it better implies the resistance aspect.

[...]

If you 'get out of the way' then things will simply continue in accordance with your intentions-so-far, as encoded in your beliefs, habits and expectations.

This is not a special state of affairs, therefore. Except that without interference your less firm intentions might fade and stop influencing events.

Attribution of different intentions to different 'levels' is just an arbitrary division in thought. There is only one mind, one structure, one experience.

>You can't get out of the way of yourself at the level of mind. You're not in the way to begin with. You are just you doing what you are doing.

Actually, I was using that phrase because the poster above used it. Not interfering to me means... well, see below.

>What you're talking about is relaxing, which is not you getting out of the way. It is you doing something different. Effort and relaxation are just modes of manifestation that you do.

I disagree here. Given that we are not talking about the physical here! You can 'cease creating' or 'cease adjusting your creation'. Since what you created was created with persistence - momentum and inertia - it doesn't just disappear. However, doing this leaves you with whatever patterns you've created within yourself so far, perhaps unintentionally (as in, unwittingly). So it's not a return to some special state. Although it may allow you to see where you are more clearly.

Effort and relaxation are experiences within mind - they are content. So that's not what I'm talking about. It's more akin to taking a break from splashing the water.

> >The water analogy isn't a good one because water has a natural tendency outside of you. Ultimately, nothing has any natural tendencies outside of you, not even you.

For sure. But no metaphor captures this entirely. "Water that splashes itself", or some such. Our difference is that you describe creation as needing 'maintained' in some way? But if I create something, it stays created until I uncreate it, surely? If I, as mind, "stop splashing myself" as it were, the creations I have made will persist as a pattern or continue until they ripple out to their natural collapse (depending on the nature of the creation).

But there is a good point here: Anything I identify with, resists being changed or dissolved. For as long as I stand as a human, I hold that creation in place, that pattern.

Been thinking why we seem to differ in this while agreeing on most things. When I talk of 'stopping creating' I'm really talking about stopping actively changing 'the facts of the world' that seed my experience - rather halting the ongoing apparent world around me, which I see as a sort of byproduct from those 'facts' and momentum. Although the content of the apparent world is my creation too, I'm just viewing it as basically *already created* because it comes from the 'facts of the world' I have established.

I like the idea of a package word. I view it ("you") as problematic in that it implies a 'perimeter' which does not actually exist - but all words do this, whether spatially (nouns) or temporally (verbs).

> >At every moment, you are maintaining the appearance of 'stable' things...

All content is manifested (more generally, all *experience* is manifested), for sure. And I get where you are coming from now. Along the line of, for instance, I can manifest the *property of stability of experience*, without being specific as to the content - just as I can manifest time going fast or slow, without adjusting the speed of individual apparent events.

> >The problem is that ordinarily we think that water has an actual natural way of behaving when we don't interfere... What I'm suggesting is that you see those rules as tentative commitments like external rules of reality.

Actually, water was a bad analogy because it's dynamic, it was that or the 'blanket metaphor'. But there's no thorough analogy really I suppose - - -

So yes, at the ultimate level I agree with you. At the ultimate level (excuse the use of the metaphor) there is no structure or non-structural - it's the "non-material material". It has no natural trajectory, because it is not a thing, and there is no context.

When I was referring to 'not interfering with yourself', I was not so bound up with mental and physical aspects and 'relaxation', but you are right that I was starting from something structural beyond simple 'open awareness' - I was beginning with the existence of the properties of persistence and momentum, although unattached to a particular object, and the notion of a 'held perspective'.

Our original commenter was talking about dropping direct manipulation, but was really only dropping down a 'level' - basically identifying with the 'space' in which content appears while not interfering with (i.e. actually continuing to identify with and accept) any patterns that were already in motion. Treating them as special.

Then, letting-go further drops you out of those patterns also. A further letting go might rid you of persistence. (Obviously, 'letting go' is a metaphor for a certain intended effect.)

What's interesting is that we can have aspects of creation that are apparently completely invisible to ourselves. Basically, 'facts in the world' that have an influence, but become so accepted that you just don't see them. Simple continuity being one of them?

[...]

Are you referring to "God's Will" here?

What is the nature of our "greater intent"? Is it some pre-birth intention by which we set ourselves in motion, but do not recall?

In that case, any direct interference we indulge in now would mean pushing against our own chosen purpose, our original desire. Instead of "asking" mode, we should rest in "receive" mode.

And, on intent, are we free to intend absolutely anything - both aligned with our selves or not - and those intentions have equal power?

> >In the context of "all realities exist" power would be the ability to to bring about a specific reality experience - reality selection.

Yes. So the question would be, is there something special about our original state/path, or are we free to change ourselves (beliefs) as we like, and adopt any path. Do we have a "destiny" at all, other than the intentions or end-points we set for ourselves?

> >what we "claim" are beliefs are also thought patterns that arise

Well, I agree with this - the word "belief" gets somewhat misused, perhaps. I see beliefs as the way you mind is structured at that moment. Thoughts that arise and events that occur will tend to be in alignment with those "beliefs" (structurings of mind). I see these structures as a feedback loop. Experiences arise (events and thoughts) which leave traces which in turn seed experiences, on forever and stabilising. Unless we use intention to change this, either indirectly (choosing experiences or creating thoughts which leave traces, changing your world gradually) or directly (amending the traces themselves, changing your world dramatically as a one-off event or a new general rule).

Often people talk of one's "True Nature" as a special thing. Are we born with a base structure that gets polluted over time? Or is there really no such base structure? The idea that we can adjust our beliefs suggests we can do anything. *Although*... we do have a base structure of "being a human, from these parents and in this environment".

> >The things we want to "learn" are desires we have that conflict directly with this resistance. The learning process is not about the achievement of a goal but in overcoming resistance.

That's a nice way to think of it. I am fond of the idea that desires are just parts of our nature that we have a resistance against, and so are not yet manifest in our experience. (Nobody ever had a desire for something they were already experiencing...)

[...]

> >It can turn out, quite suddenly, that someone you never suspected was in love with you or was a serial killer or is a master of divination.

Or, plot twist: all three.

We could view ourselves as "extended persons", expanded across a grid of all possibilities. There is an aspect of you corresponding to every possible situation or configuration. Which configuration you end up looking through as your "viewport" is a matter of intention.

> >Sure, that's a valid perspective. I think the ideas of individuals and realities and minds start getting uprooted if we talk like that and I was wanting to write something that was relatively palatable and useful within the context of individuals, realities, and minds.

And it *is* just a way of thinking about it - in the same way there is no such thing as a timeline, but it's a handy diagrammatic convenience. Intersubjectivity is the biggest stumbling block to acceptance of the dream-world view - are other people real? are actions which involve them ethical? If I am the active entity, is everyone else "hollow"?

Having some way of visualising an arrangement which allows for multiple perspectives where everyone can still get what they want can be helpful I think? Although none can ever be completely satisfactory.

Reply to “Awareness and the nth dimension”

> OP: The apparent 3 dimensional nature of waking life is an excellent tool to aid in the practice of mindful all-day meditation. By simply placing oneself outside the scope of your eyeball view (similar to centralizing your entirety in various locations of your body) one can very easily evade distraction. Experiment with different angles and "cameras"; especially interesting is placing yourself inside the head of a person you are conversing with/around. Our common interaction with mirrors makes this surprisingly easy to do so. Practice, practice, practice, and teleportation becomes tangible. Once experienced, move on to the 4th dimension, or time as it is experienced. Humans naturally attempt to understand change, and this is why we have time units, ie the second, minute, hour, etc. These are not necessary for true mindfulness, imo. The 4th dimension, when felt, spans outward in infinite directions, a constant morphing of the 3rd dimension that we choose to experience. Place yourself at the center of this, "feel" the 4th dimension warp and transform your experience as if by magic. Any form of motion is a vessel to the 4th dimension. Walk along a path, and embrace your displacement; it is the 4th dimension incarnate in your waking experience. I, however, do not know how to manipulate this experience yet. Some say they can slow down time by meditation. It seems this would only make awareness more difficult. The reason I am able to remain conscious is because I can visualize this life as a centralized blur, where my environment constantly changes appearance, and the mind remains grounded. Mathematics deals with n-dimensions, a concept that we formulate easily using symbols. Yet we struggle to perceive more than 3. I have not had a truly Lucid dream in my life, yet maybe those of you who have and have experimented with dimensional awareness can share your experiences.

> Q1: “Yet we struggle to perceive more than 3.”; This isn't true. In waking life, 3 spatial dimensions are not everything at all. For example, we sense heat/cold. Whether something hot or cold doesn't depend on location. It's another dimension. X, Y, Z, temperature. I'm talking about real experience here, btw, not physical modeling. Physical modeling is 100% off topic on this sub, but just to digress for a second, some physicists model this entire 3d world as a 2d space outside the known universe. So in other words, physical models can be arbitrarily weird and they have little to do with the experience, besides the fact that they're off topic. A dimension is simply a way to measure something. If you measure distance, you need 3d space. However, what's the distance from memory of yesterday to your table? I don't think you can measure that. So it can't be anywhere in 3 dimensions. So even ordinary experience is not 3d or 4d or whatever. Those are just simplifications, approximations, etc. They're not true.

The mountains in the distance can be no further than my experience of them, and nothing is closer to me than experience. The world has no depth! But it can definitely take a while to stop "seeing your ideas about experiencing" - e.g. seeing distance as independently real - and sometimes I quite like playing with ideas like "selecting a 3d scene from 5d space" and living from them for a bit.

I wouldn't say they are approximations though; surely they are applied patterns, active metaphors which actually shape experiencing if you are operating from them?

However, I think OP was talking about exactly that form of spatial-dimensional thinking. Your response about "only ready to experience them after a walk" seems to misunderstand what I'm saying though?

I *am* experiencing the mountains instantly, at close quarters, even as they are "smaller and less detailed" than they might be. Walking has nothing to do with how close I am to the mountains. The experiencing of walking may occur between *this* experience of the mountains and *that* experience of the mountains, but the experience won't get any closer than it already is. It will simply change in kind.

This is just a matter of the nature of experiencing, nothing to do with habits and commitments or abilities. Our *interpretation* of the experience might change of course, giving it certain apparent qualities, but the world still has no depth (=experiencing has no depth).

I'm not sure where you're going with the wall-eating-levitating stuff here? Or was that based on another interpretation of what I was describing?

> >Ideally I think we should talk about possibilities going from middle to stratosphere.

Just to emphasise though: the "world has no depth" and mountains comment says nothing about what can be done (you have extended it to that though), it is a comment about *literally* the nature of the experience. A dream about faraway mountains that are a 5-day hike away, still involves dreaming a 5-day hike to get there - however you recognise during it that you are not going anyway, it's just that your experience is evolving.

Leveraging the knowledge about the world (beyond the simple relaxation that comes with it) is another step.

On Effortlessness - Effortlessness doesn't mean you can just discontinuously alter everything right now (although potentially you might be able to). It *does* mean that the changes you do make will not involve effort. Effort is an *experience*, it is *content*. If you experience effort, it's an additional thing you've created on top of what you were focused on. Now, spending *time* - that's something different. I think that's what you mean by "effort". You need to spend time exploring yourself, finding that you have patterns which stand in the way of certain experiences you'd like to have, and so on.

I think you're trying to emphasise: Just because you understand the nature of things, doesn't mean you are suddenly going to have Super-Ultra-Wizard™ experiences. This is true. Having the correct map doesn't automatically let you redraw the landscape.

Often the response to being told that "everything is consciousness" is something like "well, why can't I just fly?" - if this is a dream, why can't I just do anything right now? The answer is:

Because it's a dream *about being a person in a world made of atoms and gravity*.

Everyone is going to have to spend some time changing the formatting of the dream. And in fact, some things may be so ingrained into the foundational pattern of the dream, that you'd have to detach from it and seed another one.

The reformatting will itself be effortless (in the sense that you won't be using *force* to make the changes) but they will still take time (bringing out aspects and refashioning them *or* more obscure intentions will take take to come via apparent plausible paths).

Actually, that's a good rule to focus on: The spontaneous content of a no-depth world is limited by *plausibility* from the perspective of the dream character. Anything could happen in the next moment, with no background occurrences leading up to it, however it will always seem plausible-if-unlikely. Only by restructuring the conceptual patterns we have adopted can we allow for increased unlikeliness.

Effortlessness shouldn't make anyone feel, well, stupid. It's a description of the experience when it happens properly; it's not a chastisement for not being good enough. It's just what we want to shoot for. Because any effort inherently means the retriggering of previous existing patterns - the experience of effort *is* the experience of reasserting a pattern and then trying to overcome it. So effortlessness is "what doing it right feels like". It will take *time* to get there, and colloquially we might say that it will "take a lot of work". There are other words we might use: "should not involve using force' and so on, but they all have their baggage.

On the rest - I'm saying that *simply* recognising it's a dream doesn't mean you can instantly "fly". However, that is the first step to even considering you might make changes. You don't just wait for it (although I think even recognition does soften the habits of reality over time) you can now sift through the patterns or assert new things - it will be "effortless" in the sense that effort you apply will block your progress. It's like asserting *being-sat-down* while intending to *be-stood-up*. Opposing directions!

So, "making things plausible" is exactly the approach indeed! :-) That's what all that patterning stuff is about.

Perhaps we need to go into specifics here? Let's stick with the sitting and standing ideas, since the (apparent) body's habits is a good place to experiment.

- **Effortless State Shifting**

  If I am in the seated position, and I want to stand, I can simply *Just Decide* or *recall into experience* the pattern of being-stood-up, and I will translate to that state. However, most people being by re-asserting the being-sat-down state first, and then perhaps assert intermediate stages while holding onto previous states. In this way, the process is experienced as being effortful.

  If instead one simply asserts the final state, experience moves effortlessly towards it - one they've released a hold on the previous state. Initially, this can take a long time. And since releasing isn't something you "do", the experimenter who tries to work out "how" they did it, can get confused when they try and make it happen again.

  So this is where spending time explicitly working on held patterns can be good. Because most of us have, over time, got into the habit of continually re-triggering out current state, re-triggering being-a-body-in-'this'-arrangement.

- **Releasing Held Patterns**

  So, one thing we can do is spend time explicitly releasing-dissolving persistent patterns. That's where *Overwriting Yourself* and related approaches enter the picture. By lying down on the floor in a fully supported position, and completely letting go of mind, body and attention (letting them roam as they will) we can release ourselves to a fully self-supporting state, and then eventually the "non-pattern" of not actually maintaining a present state at all.

  This process is not effortful, in the sense that you don't use force and you don't try to push through to a different state (because you will likely begin by reasserting the initial state to do so).

  Rather, you operate either passively - where you simply allow everything to unfold and settle out in time - investigatively - you go looking for a particular pattern, so arises in awareness, you let it unfold - or active-assertively - in which you assert a state of complete openness, and when the counter-elements to your state arise in awareness, you simply be with them and let them unfold by themselves.

So in both cases (really the same case in different contexts) we spend *time* to work through our accumulated "facts", but we don't use effort (as in force).

I'm not forgetting all the other sense, of course; that's why I often call our experience of the world a "3D-immersive multi-sensory thought". It doesn't matter for this, however: the point is that all experience is intimately close, made as it is from yourself, regardless of the nature of the content.

The world's depth has no necessary implication on its ease of change - other than emphasising that everything about the world is, contrary to first impressions, here and now and always. It opens possibilities, but it does not say how exactly they are enjoyed, except that it *must* be effortless because effort is content and "second-cause" content is not required. It does, however, let you have "right-formatted intention" because your intention is based on the world as it is as an experience, not as you think it to be as a "place".

That's not to say it's *easy* from one's current state to just do anything - of course not! - but the process itself cannot involve effort. Perhaps the main difficulty we all have is ceasing to push and hold on, and with that the fear that goes with completely abandoning everything for a discontinuous change. Even a slight maintaining of a pattern keeps everything in place, right? Hence all that gnosis stuff.

However, we should remember that: *Right-experiencing is a value in and of itself*. In fact, many if not most traditions don't go beyond this.

> >I don't think we live in a 3D world. We live in a world with some 3D data in it.

Right. It's the *immersive thought* that has a spatial component in the experiencing of it. Nothing is actually "located" anywhere except in a relative informational sense, conceptually speaking.

This is exactly what I mean by the world not being "spatially-extended". The room next door is not in fact "over there" when you are not having an experience of it.

On depth: The value of it is in the massive expansion of plausibility. Right now, you could open your door and anyone at all could be stood there. There is nothing "happening" outside your experience right now. Nothing at all. The only *definite* fact is the current sensory "observation", although we have accumulated other contributions too. If one can truly accept that only *now* is the definite fact, then I feel that this is the most expansive our "plausibility sphere" can be.

Again, "effortlessness" is what to shoot for. Yes, in a sense, we do practice and we "do nothing" to make things happen. Hence the *Just Decide* exercise. The experience should be of *things doing it by themselves*. Any effort you put in is actually *against* your goals, because it is a sign you are retriggering the current state and then trying to overcome it.

Of *course* right-experiencing is a value in and of itself. To literally and directly experience this moment as sensations, perceptions and thoughts floating in consciousness is absolutely important. It shows that the world is... *not even subjective*. This is both beyond aesthetic (it is the plain reality) and supremely practical (if you are operating from some other basis, you are shackled).

Reply to “Are we immune to reductionism just because we like subjective idealism?”

I take the view that concepts are always just relative truths?

There's never going to be a description of how things really are, because that already *is* a description - to describe it would required another description of equal or greater size. We'll never have a TOE as such - because that is basically the definition of a world, and we're surely against such definitions here except as tools? What we *can* have is a metaphysics where we, say, talk of patterns in the general sense and come up with better ways to lead people direct experiencing.

So reductionism of some sort is inevitable - the difference it that we are not confused into thinking that it corresponds to "the truth". Instead, we might view them as *active metaphors*: patterns of description which themselves have a shaping power over experience. We are never just explaining something, we are defining it and *deforming experience* with our concepts - but the subjective idealist is aware of this. They are aware of the impossibility of separating a fact from a description.

Meanwhile, all the senses and the *felt-sense* and spatial-extent and all that, they're the same thing (experiential content) and to focus on any one is to deform experience. It's all-of-a-piece. (Just notice how quickly people knacker their vision by trying to *see visuals* instead of *have perceptions*.) But that can't be captured in words, and so the visual sense tends to get used in discussion because it is easiest to describe in language and can be presented in a verbal or literal diagram better than any other, due to the persistence of a visual experience.

I don't think it's an easy way out - it's simply how things are? The nature of experience dictates it. Spatial extent isn't a thickness, it's actually "flat". There are lots of other "depth-type experiences" one can have too, but they are just that again.

To be clear though, "the world has no depth" is more about there being nothing "happening" behind what you are experiencing, rather than just the idea that there's no distance between you. It certainly has no spatial extent other than the experiencing of it, but also there is no deeper world *in the same way you are experiencing it*. It's that old thing of the world not in fact being a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time".

To reuse a tired analogy:

- You are watching a TV show. There's a scene of an office. The door opens, and a man walks in. "Elevator was broken, had to walk up the stairs", he announces.

Did he actually walk upstairs? Was there even an elevator beyond that door? In what sense does the man even have a history, in what sense does he "happen", prior to opening the door and you seeing him onscreen? In fact, in what sense are the events *after* the door opening even "happening"? In what sense is that a man, other than my concept of a man?

So we should definitely look into things deeply, but the way we look into them isn't in the manner of investigating "real world", right?

> *>[The Reframing of "Thickness":]* The advantage is that now the thickness is accessible instead of being "out there" beyond reach.

See, I'm not very happy with repurposing the word "thickness" for this. Although there's a natural problem that every word we use will imply a spatial metaphor. What matters is the complexity and entanglement of the patterns; that would perhaps correspond to your use of "thickness".

That's why I've turned to phrases such as "patterns" or "accumulated observations" or "dimensionless facts", depending on context, to describe the nature of the world - dissolved into the background awareness.

In truth it (the unobserved world) doesn't exist in any way that can be sensorily conceived of; although we can say it is dissolve in the *felt-sense* perhaps. This means we can jump straight to no longer viewing the world as a "place" in the way we have habitually assumed it to be.

Anyway, as you have indicated, what's important here is that it means *all contributing facts are available*, here and now. And this means we can "re-observe" things we don't like, and adjust them. Furthermore, we no longer need feel obliged to believe our sensory experiences, or thoughts, since they no longer represent anything; they are simply a reflection, *an aspect of*, our present extended state.

> *>[A Man Takes The Stairs:]* There would be a narrative for what happened while the man was absent. And this narrative isn't something trivial per se.

I think you exactly *can* adopt the view that there's nothing "behind" your present experience, in the sense of their being an environment that is "happening". You can *assert the truth of it* until it takes root and you'll find your experience shifts accordingly.

And that's a key thing, right? There *is no technique*. There is no *way* to do things, or even a possibility of doing things, other than the shifting of state. And the way you change state is... to change state. There's no other way or approach.

Questioning things and saying things to involve a state shift to some degree - it's inherent in the experience - and if you kept at it that shift would become stronger and one view would become "brighter" than the others. But it's a long way around?

We're just exchanging different words for the same thing. Some would equate the word "contemplation" with *thinking-about*, which would be wrong. Some would equate it with *maintaining-in-mind*, which would also be wrong. But I know what you mean.

Your "contemplation" is *my* asserting of state. And your concerns about contemplating North and South simultaneously corresponds to my example of triggering the state of being-sat-down while asserting *being-stood-up*.

Again, we still come back to: detaching from one state while bringing another into experience. And since there's no way tell anyone how to recall something, there is no technique, there's not much we can say about it. As our old pal said in *The Art of Dreaming*:

> "To intend is to wish without wishing, to do without doing.
> There is no technique for intending.
> One intends through usage." – Carlos Castaneda

Yes, we may as well stop contemplating physicalism, because you can never "solve" a point of view in order to get to another. We must leave it behind, and adopt a preferable alternative. Only by doing that do we discover

if it works - but we have to do so fully, which is not necessarily an entirely comfortable proposition for most/anyone.

How, exactly? That's what's so tricky! Our conversation is an example of that, I suppose. We make a good effort though, I think. :-)

I suggest that all we can do is offer analogies and metaphors, until we come across one that clicks, one that's the nearest to the experience - on a case by case basis. Although we can say what *not* to do clearly enough. This is an area that requires the experience; just as talking about everything being "consciousness" doesn't really mean much until you've had that experience of openness.

Okay matey. Enjoy your dreaming until next time. But watch out for mountains, please - they sneak up on you. They're much closer than you think! ;-) Cheers for now.

Reply to “Some insights from lucid dreams”

[[3man (OP): I've been trying to experiment more in my lucid dreams to get a better understanding of how they work, and hopefully glean some information about how to better operate the daily dream here.

1. Firstly, dream characters are real as fuck. You'd think after you became lucid dream characters would become very one dimensional, flat, or puppet-y, but either because I don't want that or they have a life of their own, or both, they are very lifelike even when lucid - which leads me to believe that people in the daily dream are the same. They have their own life, desires, and those are all real - but also real is the fact that they are me and I am creating them.
2. Secondly, if you can accept this, so can other people. This one I am a little skeptical to test out. So far, one girl in my life has admitted to me that she is me, even going so far as to admit everything is me. It's very funny though, as you can easily fall back into the trap of seeing the dream as having weight again - as I do countless times. I just did right now. Anyhow, knowing everything to be yourself can be a solipsistic nightmare - but you have to remember - these people all have their own desires, lives, will - you gave them that. You could take it away but for God's sake don't. That's solipsism and it sucks. Everything is you, but you want you to be free. It's an interesting two-way street.
3. Thirdly, manifesting things outside the realm of possibility. You can't do it! So, I suggest expanding your realm of possibility.

I was in a lucid dream last night. I really wanted to fly. I asked a group of my lucid dream friends what they wanted me to do. Naturally, they said "fly!" I tried, but I couldn't do it! How strange, I can always fly in my lucid dreams. Do you know when I can't fly? When I'm around people I perceive to be real. I knew these people as real, which gave my dream a weighty-ness it normally did not have. I decided I wanted to try something a little different and become an "air bender," and control the natural elemental force of air. I succeeded at first, causing a great big gust of wind, as I knew I'd be able to - but then, alas I could do it no more as I questioned how I was able to do it the first time. I created a block for myself by necessitating a reason or technique to me manifesting gusts of wind. Cleverly, one of my dream characters suggested that if I couldn't do it naturally I could find an object that I knew would enable me to. This to me was a very interesting piece of advice. Any thoughts on the ideas I've presented?]]

Great observations! By the way, if you haven't already, check out the persistent realms post over at *DreamViews*. From that...

> >Firstly, dream characters are real as fuck.

You can dream anything. Dream *that* anything is true, and then experience will line up with that. This works mostly by implication: behave *as if* something is true and the dream will behave accordingly. Look around *as if* something is going to be there, and it will be. Which then reinforces the sense that it *is* true, and so on. Dream characters are as real as... they "are".

> >Secondly, if you can accept this, so can other people.

Which could get a bit claustrophobic - like when synchronicity gets out of hand, and you get synchronicity about your interest in synchronicity, and it's like suffocating on your own dream-stuff!

> >Cleverly, one of my dream characters suggested that if I couldn't do it naturally I could find an object that I knew would enable me to. This to me was a very interesting piece of advice.

When you can't believe in 'First Cause' - the *fact* that you are "doing" everything directly - your fallback is 'Second Cause' - to delegate the power and allow you to believe something else is doing it. This can be technology, or a technique, or a spell, or a prayer, or any gesture.

It also deflects you from the fact that you cannot experience the act of creation, only its results. Treating one result as the "doing" (for instance, the flipping of switch, the shouting of a command) of another result stops this being debilitating.

> "Intent or intending is something very difficult to talk about. I or anyone else would sound idiotic trying to explain it. Bear that in mind when you hear what I have to say next: sorcerers intend anything they set themselves to intend, simply by intending it."
>
> ""Intending is the secret, but you already know that. And there is no technique for intending. One intends through Usage."
>
> -- *The Art of Dreaming*, Carlos Castenada

Another good excerpt from CC:

> "You must act like a warrior. One learns to act like a warrior by acting, not by talking. A warrior has only his *will* and his patience and with them he builds anything he wants. You have no more time for retreats or for regrets. You only have time to live like a warrior and work for patience and *will*.
>
> *Will* is something very special. It happens mysteriously. There is no real way of telling how one uses it, except that the results of using the *will* are astounding. Perhaps the first thing that one should do is to know that one can develop the *will*. A warrior knows that and proceeds to wait for it.
>
> A warrior knows that he is waiting and knows what he is waiting for. It is very difficult, if not impossible, for the average man to know what he is waiting for. A warrior, however, has no problems; he knows that he is waiting for his *will*.
>
> *Will* is something very clear and powerful which can direct our acts. *Will* is something a man uses, for instance, to win a battle which he, by all calculations, should lose. It is not what we call courage. Courage is something else. Men of courage are dependable men, noble men perennially surrounded by people who flock around them and admire them; yet very few men of courage have *will*. Usually they are fearless men who are given to performing daring common-sense acts; most of the time a courageous man is also fearsome and feared. *Will*, on the other hand, has to do with astonishing feats that defy our common sense. You may say that it is a kind of control.
>
> *Will* is not what one calls "will power." Denying oneself certain things with "will power," is an indulgence and I don't recommend anything of the kind. The indulgence of denying is by far the worst; it forces us to believe we are doing great things, when in effect we are only fixed within ourselves.

Will is a power. And since it is a power it has to be controlled and tuned and that takes time. When I was your age I was as impulsive as you. Yet I have changed. Our *will* operates in spite of our indulgence. For example your *will* is already opening your gap, little by little.

There is a gap in us; like the soft spot on the head of a child which closes with age, this gap opens as one develops one's *will*. It's an opening. It allows a space for the *will* to shoot out, like an arrow. What a sorcerer calls *will* is a power within ourselves. It is not a thought, or an object, or a wish. An act of "will power" is not *will* because such an act needs thinking and wishing. *Will* is what can make you succeed when your thoughts tell you that you're defeated. *Will* is a force which is the true link between men and the world.

The world is whatever we perceive, in any manner we may choose to perceive. Perceiving the world entails a process of apprehending whatever presents itself to us. This particular perceiving is done with our senses and with our *will*. *Will* is a relation between ourselves and the perceived world.

What the average man calls *will* is character and strong disposition. What a sorcerer calls *will* is a force that comes from within and attaches itself to the world out there. One can perceive the world with the senses as well as with the *will*.

An average man can "grab" the things of the world only with his hands, or his senses, but a sorcerer can grab them also with his *will*. I cannot really describe how it is done, but you yourself, for instance, cannot describe to me how you hear. It happens that I am also capable of hearing, so we can talk about what we hear, but not about how we hear. A sorcerer uses his *will* to perceive the world. That perceiving, however, is not like hearing. When we look at the world or when we hear it, we have the impression that it is out there and that it is real. When we perceive the world with our *will* we know that the world is not as "out there" or as "real" as we think.

Will is a force, a power. Seeing is not a force, but rather a way of getting through things. A sorcerer may have a very strong *will* and yet he may not see; which means that only a man of knowledge perceives the world with his senses and with his *will* and also with his seeing.

Now you know you are waiting for your *will*. You still don't know what it is, or how it could happen to you. So watch carefully everything you do. The very thing that could help you develop your *will* is amidst all the little things you do."

-- *A Separate Reality*, Carlos Castaneda

Totally nails it though, eh? I don't think I understood it when I first read the book years ago, but with hindsight it looks so obvious! Particularly the part (emphasised elsewhere in the book also) that your acts just don't matter. They are just things you experience. It is your *will* that accomplishes desired change. It makes it so much clearer the distinction between *will* and "will-power".

It reminds us nicely to be wary: Are you directing the *will* to bring about bodily motions that you *think* will accomplish your goal? Or are you directing the *will* to bring about the *accomplishment*? The former will create experiences of "doing stuff"; the latter will create the experience of accomplishment.

>or it is to say that your will needs some external kick in the arse to get going, making will passive.

Right, it's easy to imagine there is something you *do* that gets your *will* to accomplish things. But there is no such layer.

I suppose that without the understanding that your sensory experience is "empty" - like a mirage and has no solid backing - it is tempting to think that what you are experiencing now is "causing" something you experience later. One thought leads to another; pushing here results in a movement there; my plan is what leads to my goal. But... 'tis all "deluded doing" as you say.

I like that phrase :-)

> >This is how people come up with the idea of a mechanistic universe, materialism, physicalism, science, etc.

All of which are based on confusing metaphor with reality, and seeing Second Cause where there is only ever First Cause.

In fact, to say something is a metaphor (for something) at all is incorrect. If you fully adopt a metaphor then that *is* how it (apparently) works.

> >Or as master Yoda said, "Do, or do not, there is no try."

Yeah, that little puppet knew a thing or two. He never tried to do anything by moving himself. He always used his inner will (Frank Oz) to accomplish whatever he wanted – effortlessly! I mean, the guy doesn't even *blink*, that's how laid back he is! :-)

Reply to “Truthfulness as a quality of experience.”

I've been playing with the idea of two truths:

- ***Direct Truth*** - Something that is true by direct experience, knowing and being. This is the truth of the facts of experience. The solidity of a table, the softness of a pillow - directly, experientially true - and so are *world facts*.
- ***Conceptual Truth*** - A story or conceptual framework which is self-consistent. This is when a pattern of thought "feels right"; it has narrative coherence. A system of thought can have conceptual truth even if it doesn't correspond well to direct experience.

There is a feeling associated with both. The first is what dictates the form of your experience. However, fully adopting the second can over time affect the first, as the patterns you fully absorb can deform the structure of your mind/perception. Fully absorbed conceptual truths become direct truths.

It's the difference between *thinking-about* something and it being *directly-sensed*.

Like talking about "enlightenment" and "awareness" and "everything is one" as ideas, versus directly being it. Recalling our earlier conversations about the *felt-sense*, etc.

Call it "direct experience" and "thinking about ideas" if you like. The reason I use the word "truth" is because that's how people describe this in general, and also the idea of "truth" in philosophy and logic (self-consistent).

Call it "patterns as they really are currently" and "patterns you are thinking about".

Of course it's all "made from" the same non-stuff, ultimately, but it's not very useful to reduce everything to that level constantly. It is the source of possibilities, but the fact is that people's ongoing moment *does* consist of patterns.

> >At this point you realize you don't have to regard anything as more or less fundamental.

Neither is fundamental, as such. It's actually a matter of location (here and there).

That isn't the problem, the problem is the habit of confusing one with the other - of seeing one in terms of the other - that people confuse that a self-consistent conceptual framework with an accurate description of their experience.

This blocks development, particularly by limiting investigation by studying the "qualia" experience. The use of the word "direct" is to indicate that there is no representation involved.

Of course, at the base level, we agree with on this - it's how magick, and indeed everyday life, works - and we've covered it in earlier discussions. Hence it must be a matter of wording and getting the thoughts right.

So, the problem seems to be with the word "direct". Now, with other audiences this word makes sense, because it brings peoples attention to what is (apparently) happening in the sensory world *now* rather than being off in ungrounded thoughts.

The point I am conveying is that we must not confuse nice systems of thought with: a) the true reality, obviously, but also: b) the current state of the apparent reality, the ingrained patterns of the world.

In other words, a good story doesn't mean that's how things are. We have any number of "good stories" in our minds which we take for granted, which are without basis. We can often see those "good stories" instead of what I'm calling "direct experience" of the patterns of the present moment and *felt-sense*.

Of course, the fact that persistently thinking about something is equivalent to experiencing it, which eventually creates ingrained habits-in-the-world, is the icing on the cake.

> >All phenomena are not themselves. There is no direct experience.

Isn't it better to say something like: phenomena *are* themselves, as experienced, *and that is all they are?* For instance, a "tree" literally is that image over there + all the ideas you have about "trees". But there is no underlying, "secret causal tree" at the source of that.

> >To say that some experience is "direct" is to imply it is non-hallucinatory, genuine, authentic, and right. Now. Do you really want to suggest something like that?

Your points are valid but I don't think they apply to what I mean here. The core is the distinction between *representational* (one step removed) thinking which forms a self-consistent structure that is basically a castle in the sky - i.e. not bound to experience at all.

"Direct" is just a handy (for most) word to indicate the difference. People intuitively understand a "directness" to sensation rather than thinking, when it's pointed out. Of course, at the next level of understanding, the word is less useful.

I'm not sure what a replacement term would be for the different context, but "direct" is okay for that level.

This is a general difficulty: That descriptions applicable to one stage of understanding have to be revealed to be "not quite the correct story" at a later stage.

> >phenomena are themselves Of course not. I hope you're joking.

What do you suggest "phenomena" are?

> >You're saying you can cleave experience neatly into representational and non-. I am saying you can't do that.

No, that's not really what I'm saying. This is actually a subtle topic, mind you. However, *thoughts-about* things are not the things themselves. Self-consistent theories about awareness are not awareness, and so on.

> >You can insist on a difference ...

This is where context comes in. At one "level" there is an apparent difference which seems obviously the case. Then...

> >Anything you want them to be, except themselves.

It depends what you mean by "themselves".

> >When I do this, the thing-itself is gone after I remove thoughts-about-it.

Right, the experience of something is the full thing (the image and all meanings). Bringing a thought up about it, we summon the meanings without the "external" image. So yes, for a "tree" or whatever, they are the same thing, it's just a matter of location. So - when I speak of *Conceptual Truth* I am talking about were *structures*, associations or stories. So, a theory about something ("how it works" and "what it is really underneath") which feels true because it fits together like a puzzle, but in fact doesn't really point to anything. The word here to use is perhaps "relationships". The framework is a set of fictional *relationships* between the thoughts. Again, though, we have the problem of levels of understanding - because if you truly accept a set of relationships, the world can start to seem as if it behaves according to them. That's feedback for ya.

> >I don't know if you realize this or not...

Right. That's what the *felt-sense* thing is about. The *meaning* of a tree is felt, known, because you *are* or become that. You experience that tree and all trees. The *felt-sense* is the facts-of-the-world.

> >Maybe I could only hear, because I didn't have the conceptual framework for evoking a sense of sight using volition.

This is a good one. Or even just the first time you saw a tree, you wouldn't see a "tree". You'd see... green blobby bit on top of brown uppy-down bit. Which is a good question....

How can it be possible for us to experience a tree for the first time?

> >I agree. But what you're saying is that you can somehow bracket the relationships and examine things outside relationships and still find the same things, just without the relationships. And I am saying, that's impossible.

They are entangled, it's true. It depends on the extent to which the story is accepted, absorbed, experienced. Maybe it's better illustrated by example. Say I have the story off: marble rolls along floor, hits marble, second marble rolls - this is cause and effect, this is momentum, this is energy transference. So in my mind I have a "conceptual truth" about it.

With the senses, I just see two spheres rolling. But I *felt-sense* it as "marbles" and if I know about physics I *felt-sense* the event as a cause-effect, energy-transference.

If I believed that marbles contained "motive spirits" then I would *felt-sense* the event as an interaction of spirit personalities, entering an agreement to exchange motion.

> >When he experience this new way of forming sens-impressions, he really was confused and was asking questions about it to try to conventionalize his experience.

Interesting. We also have an extra trick here: that we experience *experiences*, knowing. When we go checking whether we "see" or "hear", then sure enough we do, but that's because we went seeking for that experience. When I "see" a door over there, normally I don't see it at all, I have a *total door experience* which isn't separated out into individual senses *necessarily*.

The channels are learned to be separate.

That arbitrary separation limits the nature of the experiences we have. For instance, it leaves no name for the *felt-sense* so people don't notice it; it leaves no name for the ability to *feel-aware* out into the space around you and into other objects and people (which we might call "presence").

In fact, apparently-personal experience really is about that *feel-aware* thing. Try withdrawing that sphere back into yourself, and you'll quickly discover you "go blind". You might still kinda see stuff, but it's like peripheral vision, and you don't have the sense of *meaning*.

> >You see shaded circles, and they're not rolling, they're just moving. :) But if you keep stripping it down, then the circles will need to go.

Yes, this is of course right. So here we go, we're getting to a better description for the oneironaught vs the everyday guy:

The difference between (what I called) *Direct* and *Conceptual* truth is simply the extent to which a *pattern* has become ingrained, stabilised, become a fact-of-the-world. This is of course a continuum; the two terms indicate the extreme cases.

> >So for example, I realize the cup is to the left because I can imagine it being in all sorts of other locations. I don't actually have to imagine it, just the fact that I can, if I want to, means I have tacit imaginary context that I am using to give meaning to the cup's location.

Yes, you instantly are aware of all the possibilities of "cup-ness", because that's what "cup-ness" is.

> >There is no experience that corresponds to the Direct extreme. I hope you realize this.

Sure, neither extremes exist, although the *idea* of the extreme is useful for gaining understanding at a certain level. If you are having *any* experience at all then you are experiencing a concept, albeit of an extremely subtle, low-amplitude form.

I mean, even the concept of a "concept"... arrgg, there is no escape! Ah, but yes - take a step back, switch context.

> >I think it's dangerous.

Well, I think you and I have an ongoing disagreement about how to describe things. You seem to prefer a jump-to-the-end approach, whereas I see a staged approach as better. Depends on the audience, really You're right that getting stuck at any conception is a risk.

> >Illusion

Always a tricky word. I like the "playdough of experience" metaphor though. :-)

[...]

From last week's episode of *Constantine* (spoilers):

> Lily wakes up to rejoin the living world, but John and Ritchie remain in the construct. Ritchie wants to stay behind in his own reality, basically as a God, so who can blame him?

> Constantine can. He warns his friend that he's eventually going to go as crazy as Shaw, and that his decision isn't about creating his own world, it's about running away from the real one. Having regained consciousness, John pleads with Ritchie, still in his altered state, to come back to him ... which he does after a few moments of hesitation.
>
> Having found new purpose, Ritchie puts more effort into his teaching position, lecturing about humanity's certainty of suffering, giving into cravings, and the possibility of inner peace.
>
> *-- Constantine Season 1 Episode 11 Recap*

Maybe you should quit all this reality-messing, playing God, and just get a nice teaching job.

I do enjoy the show and it sometimes gives me a bit of food for thought. (And it's interesting when the topic of a TV show synchronistically relevant. Although in *my* reality I wouldn't be hacking the hands off innocent kids. Promise.)

I like being encouraged to question myself occasionally - particularly in "these matters". Because it's easy to go off-path.

You might prefer another quote:

> *Ritchie:* "All this time you've been here, you coulda been building worlds. You coulda been redefining life and how we live it. Instead you gave into your weakness, and when you did, that's the day you became obsolete."

[...]

> >For the old decision to have force you have to ongoingly consent to it continually.

My "concern" would be that a person can be unaware of the old decision.

This is an opportunity: I still don't like the "ongoing decisioning" language. So how about this:

- Our *intention* is the temporal landscape of our world, which we experience moment-to-moment, laid out timelessly. It is equivalent to the fact-of-the-world. To say "we have an intention" is just to say "my landscape is this shape", to say that *what I am is this shape*.
- To *intend* is to change that landscape. We intend by simply changing our shape, since the landscape is us. We *become* the result, even though the facts we have inserted might only unfold as sensory experience at some point in the apparent future.

So (being dualistic for a moment), your intention is the blueprint and to intend is to change the blueprint.

Reply to “Feedback model of experience”

[[OP: I've been interested in feedback loops as a model for a lot of different things and I tried to communicate a consciousness feedback loop, but I was too vague before. I would like your help in expanding on this concept.

I declare two systems we'll call belief and perception. They are in a feedback loop that we'll call experience. Perceptions seem external and beliefs seem internal. Perception influences belief by manifestation. Belief influences perception by intent and willpower (maybe? Haven't hashed this out very well). In the materialist experience perceptions absolutely must influence beliefs. To phrase it in terms of a feedback loop, perception amplifies the existing beliefs through manifestation (the signal). To a materialist, if beliefs influence perceptions, they're probably misleading until verified with more perceptions (experimentation as extremely compelling confirmation bias). Anomalous perceptions, while possible due to beliefs usually taken for granted, are discarded as faulty equipment (believe none of what you hear and half of what you see).

Wizards tend to lean towards beliefs influencing perceptions strongly such that each and every perception is possible based on our beliefs and they're prone to what would usually be considered anomalous experiences. The signal going from belief to perception is the intent combined with willpower (the willingness and sincere desire to override perception). However for me, it's easy to fall back into materialism because my will to change my beliefs is overpowered by my habitual perceptions. Or, my intent+will signal is overpowered by my manifestation signal.

> **Feedback** occurs when outputs of a system are routed back as inputs as part of a chain of cause and effect that forms a circuit or loop. The system can then be said to *feed back* into itself. The notion of cause-and-effect has to be handled carefully when applied to feedback systems.
> - Wikipedia
>
> Simple causal reasoning about a feedback system is difficult because the first system influences the second and second system influences the first, leading to a circular argument. This makes reasoning based upon cause and effect tricky, and it is necessary to analyze the system as a whole. As provided by Webster, feedback in business is the transmission of evaluative or corrective information about an action, event, or process to the original or controlling source.
>
> - Karl Johan Åström and Richard M. Murray, *Feedback Systems: An Introduction for Scientists and Engineers*

To consider a chicken and egg argument is fruitless because they monistically exist simultaneously with experience.

> mo·nism
>
> n. Philosophy
>
> 1. The view in metaphysics that reality is a unified whole and that all existing things can be ascribed to or described by a single concept or system.
>
> 2. The doctrine that mind and matter are formed from, or reducible to, the same ultimate substance or principle of being.

monism ('mɒnɪzəm)

1. (Philosophy) philosophy the doctrine that the person consists of only a single substance, or that there is no crucial difference between mental and physical events or properties. Compare dualism2 See also materialism2, idealism3

2. (Philosophy) philosophy the doctrine that reality consists of an unchanging whole in which change is mere illusion. Compare pluralism5

3. (Philosophy) the epistemological theory that the object and datum of consciousness are identical

4. the attempt to explain anything in terms of one principle only

Thanks for your perspectives.

Addendum: I realized the source of some of my confusion. I will replace perception and manifestation. So belief influences manifestation through perception rather. The strength of that pathway is based on repeatability. It's a mostly passive pathway, yin, etc.. The belief system receives perceptions from the manifestation system. Willpower is the strength of the belief->manifestation pathway and intent describes the information to manifest. So to re-word my wizard and materialist stereotypes the materialist is extremely passive and the wizard is extremely active (in regards to influencing manifestation and belief). I'm onto something...

Here's a blurry picture of a graph for you to peep, complete with the remnants of my dinner:



]]

This is along the same lines of my own thinking, however I approach it a little more simply in terms of structure. Belief and perception (experience) are of the same thing - they can be seen as the same thing at different stages of solidification.

In fact, my next multi-part post was going to be called *Magick is Memory* (along with one on *Overwriting Yourself*) and be on this very topic. But, here goes with a quick summary version; see how it fits in with your ideas:

Passive Memory

Every experience that arises leaves a trace in awareness, an after-image. That trace influences subsequent experiences, which are filtered through it. Which in turn strengthens the trace. In short, there is a *memory effect*. Over time, certain patterns become more entrenched - habits, beliefs - just as the flow of water deepens channels in a landscape via erosion.

This is the *passive mode* and this is how the landscape of our worlds are formed at the start. There is a randomness of activation (random rainfall) which due to the clumsiness of randomness seeds patterns (eroded areas), which eventually turn into stable habits (deepening erosion into channels and pathways). Experience shapes beliefs shapes experiences. Beliefs are *the same as* habits of the world. Beliefs are not things you *think*, they are the structure of your world.

It is not just apparently "external" experiences that participate in this effect though: simply *thinking* a pattern will also contribute to this effect, although to a lesser extent.

Active Shaping

The magician realises that this is the situation, and seeks to benefit from it in an *active mode*, using a couple of extra insights:

- The resistance of patterns to change is related to his gripping of those patterns, his identification with those patterns.
- He can stand back and identify as the background awareness, which is unaffected by pattern and memory.
- If he does so, then the effect of his consciously directed thoughts (summoning a 1st-person imaginary experience corresponding to his desire = intention) is greatly amplified, even instant - because he can completely sidestep trying to push it and hence resistance.
- In the extreme case, simply *deciding* will be sufficient.
- It is generally easier to have manifestations that are consistent with the deepest habits, so that the occurrence can still be dismissed as "plausible". For instance, those lost keys don't directly materialise in mid-air, they appear in the drawer you already looked in (but perhaps you hadn't looked properly?), and so on.

Effectively, the magician makes his world more vulnerable to the 'memorisation' effect, leading to a more rapid circumvention, alternation or dissolution of existing habits - for a one-off manifestation or for a change in how the world works. In either case, the magician is "inserting new facts" into the world; he is updating its memories to correspond to the world he desires.

The overall situation is somewhat sketchily illustrated in this diagram.


Enfolded Form
- Residual pattern built up from previous experiences, subject to direct intention
"Experiential Mind-Space"
Unfolded Object
- Experience snaps to and unfolds in alignment with enfolded forms, spontanously and automatically

Fig 1. An illustration of the relationship between enfolded forms (belief, expectation, memory traces) and unfolding experience. In an ongoing feedback process, experiences leave traces which then in-form the structure of subsequent experiences, as spatial and temporal structures - i.e. objects and narrative, respectively. To change the nature of experience requires exposure of the ground to alternative types of experience ("external" change) or a shifting of the form of the ground directly ("internal" or first-cause change).

Additional Comments

Was looking at the initial version of your post, just saw the update - your little picture is basically the "process diagram" for my own! Nice. I do believe we don't need the extra step of separating them into "systems" though in the end. That's fine for illustrating a process, but there is no separation between filter and flow, between belief, perception, experience, manifestation - it's the same patterns being activated.

"There is only awareness - with raw creativity (randomness) and memory (persistence) on the passive side; the active side is simply awareness deliberately shaping itself, changing or circumventing memory at the root level."

This gets away from the chicken-egg metaphor problem.

I originally started along this line of thinking to describe how people always think they are right in their world-view - could it possibly be because they literally experience their beliefs as reality? Beliefs *are* the laws or habits by which your world unfolds? How to intervene in this? And so on. This became a disussion in materialism vs idealism vs nondualism over at a philosophy forum.

[...]

That Jacob Lieberman book is interesting. It think his central experience was accidental though, but he almost got there. Great point that the assumption of an external world (or, assumptions about vision) inhibit progress:

People don't see with their eyes unless they centre their attention there, thus limiting their vision drastically - what's meant to happen is that vision *comes to them* in their minds. If they'll let it! Simply changing "where you sit" in your body-space, and letting your awareness open out instead of concentrating, can have a dramatic effect. Hence "seeing from the core" and similar approaches.

> This technique explores the central line of the body. It relates to the spine and spinal cord, as well as to the chakras, the flow of chi and other energetic paradigms. The center or mid-line is especially important in vision because our two eyes need to coordinate around this line in order to work well together. Once the student has learned to find this central, energetic line, she/he finds the place on it that is the most comfortable, and rests there. Most people have a place inside themselves that is familiar and feels like home. For instance, one person may have done a great deal of martial arts, and centering in the belly is easiest. For another, centering in the chest is more natural. We each have our preferences and styles. In addition, vision is not always the primary sense we are using at any given moment. We cannot attend equally to what we are hearing, seeing and sensing. One sense must be the most important, or “the figure”, while the others are less important, or “the ground.”
>
> -- *Seeing From The Core*, Rosemary Gaddam Gordon

But if people won't give up control, of holding onto their old way, they're screwed.

Good test to do with yourself: Sit back and be in the room. Do you feel that the room around you is in focus, just "there"? Or do you feel that you are scanning around, and that the world is blurred in parts, like in a movie scene? If you are relaxed and letting vision "happen", the whole room should be just "there". Because it's not actually possible for your eyes to be seeing the whole room anyway; you are dreaming it.

The same lessons apply to perception and action more generally.

> > Seeing from the core is a deliberate choice. It's an aspect of control, not the giving up of it. Maybe you mean, people need to learn to exercise control in a more skillful manner?

Yes, the wording depends on the perspective. They are giving up trying to *control seeing* by effort, but of course in ceasing to do that they gain influence over their experience more fully. Their previous attempt at control has obscured the nature of the situation, and the nature of the control they *should* be exercising. Enjoy your walk.

> > It's not just that they gain more influence. The act of the giving up of this "control" is a **deliberate** choice. It is a type of self-control (or self-influencing).

At first, they are are influencing the wrong thing - creating the wrong thing: generating the experience of feeling their eyes, rather than of open vision.

[...]

> [OP: However for me, it's easy to fall back into materialism because my will to change my beliefs is overpowered by my habitual perceptions. Or, my intent+will signal is overpowered by my manifestation signal.]

This willingness to ignore the evidence (what you are seeing and how you are feeling) and push on regardless is one of the most difficult things.

The identification with the background rather than content is maybe a version of doing this, actually: It disengages you from taking the passive arisings "seriously", reducing the fear factor of disruption them, which then makes active assertions less troublesome.

[[Q: “I think switching from a passive to a more active role in your own perceptions is sometimes a slow process. I have to say "sometimes" because I should not bring too much prejudice into it.”; Well, I don't see them as exclusive at all. I could have a strong concern for repeatability and I could also have a strong willpower. I think this would cause instability in my beliefs and in my manifestation however. For example, lots of people have an intense experience because they finally work up a strong will but it seems so "powerful" (due to not challenging the passive path) which usually causes the practitioner to stop for a while, until there's more familiar stability. So if someone is particularly brave and certain of their path, they could go really hard on the active part and ignore the oddities, building up in a positive feedback loop which might seem unstable.

I think it's, on the whole, a better bet to downregulate the positive path a while, until I seem cynical, skeptical really. Nothing could change my opinion, not even if aliens land on my roof, not even if the president calls me, not even if I wake up in Candyland.

Then the positive feedback of the active path can be used and the passive path could be amplified again without causing a huge instability/existential crisis.

I was reflecting on the Shurangama sutra while thinking of a response to TriumphantGeorge. At 1:248 Buddha finishes describing what the mind isn't and where it isn't. But Ananda becomes surprised when Tathagata points out that what he's using to "investigate it" (i understand it as, consideration/contemplation) isn't his mind, which disturbs him. Tathagata clears it up by saying "It is your perception of false appearances which deludes your true nature and has caused you from beginningless time to your present life to . . . lose your eternal source . . .." Which tells me that while my intent and willpower might be launched from the system of beliefs, the beliefs are noumenal and my actual thoughts, my internal monologue and what not, are perceptions going back into the belief system.

Maybe noumenal isn't the right word. I mean: utterly imperceptible and existing outside of manifestation, including my internal monologue and visions of concepts.]]

You mention something else which is worth pursuing:

> >But Ananda becomes surprised when Tathagata points out that what he's using to "investigate it" (i understand it as, consideration/contemplation) isn't his mind, which disturbs him.

The word "mind" is really problematic. It gets used for "thinking" and for "the space my thoughts and sensation arise in" and also for "the object-less non-material material that is the substrate for experience, and is my true nature".

I see what we "are" as the background ("awareness"), any object or pattern content or traces - beliefs, experiences, etc - are all of the first two types. Magick is about modifying the patterns. Insight or enlightenment is about recognising yourself as the background rather than any pattern. Of course, the two go

hand in hand, since patterns are "of" the background. But really it needs defined every time it's mentioned, it seems.

The origin of the world then, which required pattern and persistence, is not itself a property of awareness. An finite number of random 'flickers of pattern' can have occurred before the first one that lingered as an after-image, a memory, then even longer before two occurred, which then allowed a stable and interrelated, self-supporting set of patterns to emerge.

(The word "consciousness" is also problematic because people think of it as localised *self*-consciousness.)

Usefulness is the way to judge things, definitely! And models are a great way to explore your assumptions and a soften the edges, give you something to work with. (Because it's hard to start with "everything is possible" and then truly adopt that. Even trained pilots, who know they can fly because of the machine they're sat in, still take off from ground level...)

Although, contrary to the old saying, actually the territory does become the map after a while, to a greater or lesser extent. Of course it has to, otherwise we couldn't have magick (= assertion of truth and subsequent consistent effects). The more flexible and ambiguous the situation, the more easily the effect becomes "memorised" by the world. For instance, simply and truly deciding - *and feeling the certainty of the fact* - that you will have a lucid dream will give you lucid dreams.

Reply to “The Word”

[[OP: The secret is in using the Word to regain power. The Word being all arts, essentially. I am so good at creating stories that I have been duping myself with them for centuries.

Free myself, And free all others

Through a story

That can be shared

It's all a story, so might as well write a _____ one.

Never title your story,

Until it is finished.

The Word is a powerful tool / Do not underestimate the power of the Word to heal and restore.

restore emptiness.

We don't know know until there is a Word for it.

Feeling is Word Sight is Word Thought is Word Only peace is not Word Peace is Eternal God

The Word is a signpost to God, and from God to any experience.

Use the Word you want more of More.

Use the Word you want less of Less.

The Word is a focuser of divine Energy.

Thoughts are the subtlest and most deadly Words. Watch your inner monologue. Always be thoughtless when doing everything with the exception of thinking.

The *World* is already made up of Words all around.

The Word is Form.

I am.

Observer and Speaker of Words.

My body is a Word.

The Mind produces and is a Word.

I am not the Word, or any of them...

I am the Wordless.]]

> A1: In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

> OP: Oh they do say that the Word was God? Interesting, I see it differently as though the creations are not in fact the God, but rather his creations and... yes I see this separation as a little artificial, but it

> helps to identify with the unlimited, as that is what we are, and it is easier to identify with form than it is to identify with unlimited freedom on a daily basis. Still, I do see the Word as being potentially what we are - also perhaps we are the container of the Word? Thoughts? Is the Word the container of the Word?

Yeah, true: it's not The Word was "God", it's The Word **was God**, in the sense of:

- God is a term for "the creator".
- The Word is Man's imagination.
- To imagine is to create (by triggering patterns, in experience, which subsequently reappear in experience).
- Hence, The Word (imagination) *was* God (the creator of subsequent experience).

But also, as you know, current experience is also made of imagination, so The Word is part of experience too, hence the "was with God" part. So God is everywhere and all things, He is the creator *and* the created, and *all is imagination*.

The main sense is: Imagining something *instantly* triggers its larger pattern across time and space, which you subsequently experience.

You may artificially consider a certain localised are of time-and-space experience to be "you", but you are *literally* imagining this to be so. It is just a subtle feeling-boundary floating in space, which has no effect except that it might limit what you allow yourself to conceive of.

It's a worthwhile exercise to try and work out where, in your experience of the room right now, "you" end and "everything else" begins. Most people feel that, mysteriously, although they might be located in a small dot in their head (which is obviously not the case) they also extend to a spherical region outside their body (their personal space, again obviously not true).

Then: imagine something, any object, like an owl (my current favourite) and try to work out where that thought is bounded in time and space. To do this, you will first have to locate time and space. If you can't locate that, then your thought cannot be so restricted...

I say: Anything you imagine *always and instantly* triggers its extended pattern across all time and space. (I see I said that twice. So I guess it must be important.)

[...]

Great topic, /u/3man!

> >Both are releasing an idea into the sphere of experience. Writing something down can have such immense effects.

I say - symbols don't *point* us to anything, and we don't release things into the sphere. That implies a space and a place that doesn't exist. Anything you can conceive of can happen, because conceiving of something *is* it happening. A word is just part of an extended pattern, and recalling the word is to trigger the whole pattern.

> >Therefore, the symbol, or Word, acts merely as a reminder to the experience.

Right, but literally a *re-minder*. To activate that pattern in mind. It will then automatically appear in all your experiences. In fact, as soon as you have *re-called* a pattern this way it is *instantly* activated across time and space. You then encounter that pattern you have created, as you pass from moment to moment.

It's worth spending some time attending to your actual experience, in terms of what it is made up from. For instance, see your visual scene as a "flat" drawing, an outline. Note that the patterns that outline is made from seem to recur, and once you have noticed a particular arrangement, you will see it again and again.

This is the level that activation occurs at... absolutely all levels of a pattern are triggered across experience, from the abstract silhouettes to the relationship dynamics.

> >I suppose the caveat is that you have to have experienced something as it is, not symbolically, before you can use a Word to get yourself back there.

Well, if the word is meaningful at all, it is part of a pattern, and saying the word will summon that pattern. If you have any conception at all of something, you can have it. You don't necessarily need to have *consciously* (but which I mean, "have perceived sensorily") experienced it before.

It really is beneficial to see your environment as a really simple, automatic "imagination space" which you are stirring around by activating patterns. Then it makes sense why you should occasionally sit down and stop "remembering things" - to let "the swirl" settle and clear.

> >Giraffes!

So, the extended pattern of "giraffe" has: the visual image, outline and silhouette, that camouflage, lock necks, hooves, zoos, tall trees, personal experiences in childhood, that story your mother read you, etc. All those will be triggered across time-space and be "mixed in" with whatever is already there. Even in very subtle ways, potentially. Such as the arrangement of a chair being like a giraffe, leaning against a table with a bowl of leafy salad. If you imagined the giraffe in a particular 3D location in your perceptual field, then you might tend to encounter animals with them being located in that same location in your senses.

You get the idea.

Note that when I say time-space, I mean that for convenience because that's how experience appears to be formatted. In actual fact, there is *only* this imagination space and it's all a swirl of patterns now.

> >But my question is, is every sensory experience combining aspects of previous sensory experiences?

I'd say all patterns are combinations - superpositions? - of other patterns. And there is always something in play. So when you bite into that alien fruit, then you already have the "formattings" of, say, "taste", "fruit", visual resemblance to other things, other things currently in mind and in context.

> >Right, so my problem is I keep viewing the pattern that I'm viewing right now, and the pattern that is hidden.

This is tricky to think about, certainly. Here's one approach:

All patterns are *always* activated and *always* contributing to your sensory experience right now, to differing degrees. It is tempting to think that "giraffe" is hidden away somewhere, but actually it is *to a very subtle extent* informing your experience right now anyway.

Your perceptual-imagination space is like a holographic space in which all patterns are present. "Remembering" or "imagining" is the process of increasing the intensity of a pattern briefly via attention/triggering. Once you've done that, it seems to dim from the heights you raised it to, but it is now contributing more strongly. If you held the pattern long enough, strongly enough, or with zero interference or resistance, in an attitude of absolute allowing, perhaps it wouldn't dim at all...

So to let the swirl settle is to "stop triggering" or "stop intensifying" by letting your attention open out and dissolve.

> >last night I had a dream that I went through this ritual of some kind.

That's an good one. Have you experimented with music-making while lucid dreaming? I was heavily into old synths and stuff for a while and had the idea that creating new sounds in my sleep would be great, but I never actually did it.

TL;DR: Think of all patterns as being present *right now*. Nothing is hidden or elsewhere; they are simply not activated at an intensity level that is noticeable.

> >And by "I became formless." I mean, I stopped perceiving myself to be limited to a physical body. Gotta' be careful with language!

Ha, yes. "I was no longer identified with form", "there was no longer any experience of being identified with form", that kind of thing. I know what you mean. :-)

> >A question: Do you feel physical bodies are a necessary tool - and if not, what are some good alternatives and how would I facilitate it/them?

Well, physical bodies (I'd say) are an experience. They consist of sensations and appearances; they are a pattern themselves. They are like the "first enabling technology". They are an excuse or a permission to have things happen, via "action". If consciousness is First Cause then bodies are not necessary for summoning change - all that is required is *to intend*. And neither is any other tool really. But in order to have an "experience of doing" then something like a body with sensations is required.

That's the trick of this whole thing, isn't it? Some may want to be All Powerful and - well, you are already. But if you just went full out and had just straight-to-the-outcome manifestation every time, you'd actually have no experiences. So the balance probably is: be *aware* of the nature of things and therefore avoid undesired suffering, avoid accidental creation of misery, and *knowingly* generate desired change or leave alone and bask in experience. The most important thing: knowing this gives us the confidence to step back and just be and allow. Without this, we feel we must interfere and "make things happen" all the time, often with accompanying ongoing physical tension.

> >Some limitation in certain instances allows for some very unique expressions.

Limitation is often a source of creativity, right?

As a minor example, if there was no "gravity habit" then animals and objects wouldn't be shaped as interestingly as they are. No need for legs and motion-generating structures and the like. If we didn't "need" to eat, then a whole source of pleasurable activities would be denied to us - etc.

And since you are never *actually* physical (you are just having sensations, thoughts, perceptions consistent with - "as if" that were true), you get the best of both worlds.

> >I feel like I'm going to enjoy life a little more now

Aha, then my work here is done! :-)

The balanced view is to go "yes, it's an imagination room" but life is about experiences, and immersing ourselves in them. Yes, I can use fast travel to jump between desired circumstances, but once I'm in one it's fun to let it play out. Doing these things *knowingly* rather than accidentally is the benefit.

Additional thought: Just as an aside on this "words and patterns" thing (triggering, autocompletion, and all possibilities already being available), it's interesting to compare what we're talking about with older descriptions - e.g. Akasha ("primary substance") and the Akashic Records (random link - all experiences have already happened *at least* as potentiality, as patterns).

Even current metaphors such as "it's all a computer simulation" are really just another way of saying: the whole of infinite reality is "encoded' into the background; your current sensory experience isn't "solid" like you think it is.

[...]

"The Word of God is the Imagination of Man"

[...]

[[A: I like to think of it in the form of an allegory.

The highest being said to itself "I shall snap my metaphorical fingers and grant myself any power I can imagine".

HB snaps its fingers and grants itself the most maximally awesome ability it can have: the ability to grant itself any ability it can imagine by way of a snap.

From this, **HB** comes to know that to have granted itself such an ability, it must have already carried such an ability.

An eternity of eternities was spent in this manner: **HB** granting itself the most maximally awesome ability: Total Limitlessness. Absolute Freedom. All Knowledge. Omnipotence. Different labels for the same thing.

'One day', **HB** recognizes that such ecstasy is an endless wishing for more wishes.

> And here the story is interpreted in different ways.

HB uttered, "But what's the point?"

An *ERROR* occurred and **HB** became a human. The human carries this mistaken thought within its core: seeking meaning for its experiences. But all was meaninglessly brought into existence, and the human performed its most basic function of pattern-seeking.

But **HB** never lost its ability to grant itself anything it can imagine.

So **HB** poured itself out at the behest of its human self, and continued its search for meaning as *Human*, growing in power on its climb back to Absolute Freedom, with its own Meaning in tow.

Becoming *Human*, **HB** became the Point.

> Pun intended.

An alternate version:

HB said to itself: "I have no limits. But what do I want?

A *Paradox* occurred.

"I have no limits ---> I have no lack ---> I have no want"

"What do I want? ---> What do I lack? ---> What is my limit?"

The answer: **Nothing**.

An alternate version:

In the beginning, there was **Nothing**. A **Void**.

And **Void** thought to itself: "What is it that I am?"

And **Void** recognized that to think "I AM" it would first need to BE.

So **Void** thought, "I AM THAT WHICH IS". Or, "I AM THAT WHICH 'I-AMs'". Or, I AM THAT I AM.

> YHWH

In this, **Void** granted itself existence and conceived its next thought: What if I WAS-NOT?

And **Void** ceased to think.

Yet, the underlying mechanism of I AM was still potent, and after an immeasurable amount of time, **Void** thought: I AM THAT I AM. The birther of all that is. The mechanism of action for making every thought into an experience.

> How this mechanism works is a different metaphor.

After some timeless Ceasing and Becoming, **Void** thought to itself: What if I Was Not -> 'I AM THAT I AM'?

And an *error* occurred, for this was a *paradox*. **Void** had found the only limit to its wonderful **Imagination**. It could not cease turning its thought into experience. But it could forget.

And so *Limit* was born. *Limit* had many names, among them: *Lack*, *Want*, *Desire*.

The only thing **Void** could *Desire* was *Desire Itself*. So it became *Desire*, more infamously known as *Ego*. That is, *Man*.

And *Man* came to know the **Void** from which he was created, and he sought the completion of his *Desire* through this mechanism he called **"God"**.

God de-sired *Man*. **God** bore (gave birth to) *Man*. Created *Man*. Suffered *Man*.

> De-sire = Burden = Birth = Creation = Suffering

But *Man*, who was *Incompleteness Itself* eventually completed his *Desire* (ego) and he grieved, for he remembered that he was **God**, who was **Complete**.

As **God** he thought: Imagine-that -> I AM *INCOMPLETE*.

And he became *Man*.

As *Man* he thought: Were that my *Incompleteness* would **BE COMPLETE**!

And he became **God**.

And **God** came to know futility. And he recognized himself as both **Complete** and *Incomplete* and he knew himself as **Godman**.

Void, whom *Man* called **"God"**, in its Omnipotent Imagination had resolved to grant itself the ability to *Desire* and simultaneously **Fulfill** that *Desire*.

The *Incompleteness* of **God** is *Man*.

The **Completeness** of *Man* is **God**.

This is **Godman**.

Godman *Desires* **Himself**, **Creates Himself** and is **Complete** in his *Incompleteness*.

And **Godman** thought: IMAGINE-THAT I AM NOT **GODMAN**.

Everything unraveled and reraveled. For a time, once more *Man* forgot that he was **God** and the illusion was maintained. But eventually, his *Desire* was completed once more and he once again knew himself as **Godman**.

Godman contemplated once more and thought: IMAGINE-THAT I AM **GODMAN** AND **NOT-GODMAN**.

And **Void** performed a miracle. **Godman** shattered himself into many pieces, all of which were **Godman** and yet were **Not-Godman**, for they were separate.

> These are the children of Void/God/Mind/Ether/Spirit/Highest Being/Oneness (for in the beginning there was one (Void), then two (Godman) then from three flowed all else [1,2,3,5...].

Void, which was Unreal turned itself inside out to make the UNREAL into that which is REAL. THOUGHTS transitioned from the IMAGINATION to REALITY.

{

The simplified thought process went something like this:

- I AM (Awareness)
- not-I AM (Void/Mind/Highest Being)
- not-not-I AM (Awareness Must Be)
- I AM/I AM (Metacognition, Imagination, Simulation, Abstraction)
- not-I AM/I AM (Man/Ego/Content of Experience/Patterns/Objects/Limits/Boundaries/Every "Thing")
- not-not-I AM/I AM (Imagination Must Be)
- I AM/I AM + not-I AM/I AM (The Dual-Nature of Godman)
- not-I AM/Godman (The Illusion of Separation, The Veil, Forgetting the Divine Nature)
- not-not-I AM/Godman (Godman Must Be, Limitlessness + Desire Must Be, Oneness)
- I AM/Godman + not-I AM/Godman (The Pouring-Out of the Highest Self, Life, Self-Propagation, Consciousness)
- not-I AM/Consciousness (Sleep, Death, Change, Transience)
- not-not-I AM/Consciousness (Transcendence, Ascension, Rapture, Rebirth, Deification, After-life)

}

> Below is the special contextual effect of this process that all happened simultaneously, rather than in a discrete order.

not-not (Nonduality, Every-thing Must Be. All Things Exist. Any-Thing is Possible)

Can be thought of as Big Bang, perhaps. This was the Negation of Negation-Itself, when Duality (Godman) turned in upon itself and Nonduality was born. The greatest Miracle of all, **Highest Being** died, Killing Death, giving Life to Life.

And **Highest Being** is Reborn/Born-Anew/Resurrects as any spark of consciousness in any thing. Any-thing can be any-thing, all has the God-potential of **Limitlessness** and all has the Man-potential of *Desire* and *Meaning*. All things truly Exist, All things Can Be Experienced.

And what of **Highest Being**? **HB** resides in **Unreality** (Void/Mind/Context-of-All-Experiences), sustaining *Every-Thing*, pouring itself out in a synergy with all of its 'children'.

The *Desire* of **HB** is *Man*, for *Man* is *Desire-Itself*. Therefore, anything that *Man Desires* is a direct reflection of the *Desire* of the **Highest Being**.

It is truly beautiful. A more perfect system could not be devised.

An alternate version: The **Highest Being**, in an infinitesimally tiny fraction of a moment, thought all of the above in the form of a **Divine Blueprint**, to *Be Fruitful* (create) *Multiply*, *Propagate Self*. The **Divine Blueprint** for *Life* and the *Gravity-nature of Consciousness*.

HB subjected itself to its **Divine Blueprint** and *Everything* came into existence, notably *Humanity*, which has the ability of **HB Itself**: *Creative Imagination.]]*

Reply to “Connection between weather and Self”

So if it's "all you" then the shifting of your mood *is* the feeling in your stomach *and* the darkening of the sky. Part of the same pattern?

At first that presents a problem: no cause and effect, how do we utilise it? But if you deliberately "summon" the feeling that goes with a clear sky, it kinda works, particularly if that's part of the intent of the shift. Good while camping.

Technically, if you are very open and allowing, you should be able to simply command a change with intent and the shift will occur - the command should trigger or imply the pattern. Not something I've ever thought to try though. The relevance here might be that there *are* no causes in sensory experience - everything is *effect* - and this a good way to highlight that.

But somehow "editing" nature seems to be a special thing.

Is that because the natural environment is in some way more directly "us" than technological objects or other people?

Reply to “Some more lucid dreaming epistemology”

The waking dream is dreamed that way; you've dreamed that you-the-character are restricted; experiments reveal this not to be the case.

You can *choose to dream* a persistent, permadeath realm as a lucid dream if you want, and it will be pretty much like this waking life.

[...]

> Q: That's interesting. I think you may be on to something with that notion. I've found the dreams I stay in (longer) are the one's where I don't try to do too much, and instead stay calm, breathe, and act like it's no big deal while exploring the current environment.

I was talking about this over at /r/luciddreaming, responding to a post about persisting the dream (via spinning, looking at your hands, concentrating on a sensation, etc). The summary: avoid narrowing your focus when you do anything. Leave your focus open. This is a mistake we do in real life too (we "concentrate" our attention when performing an activity, rather than simply intending it).

Reply to “Let's all stop pretending we don't want infinite power.”

Hmm. If you're referring to the last post, I interpreted it as saying one should be careful of thinking you have real power when in fact you are just exploring-experiencing your thoughts *about* power.

Fake power is when your idea of how the creative process works is incorrect. (Particularly if it depends on the belief of some unobserved entity-based.)

If you believe in the incorrect idea, then its a reduction of your power. You get the results, but from ignorance. If someone is getting results from *belief-based approaches* then they're no better than the chaos magicians who thought they were being belief-independent.

> Q: What I am asking is this. When you get results, how do you know whether the results are from ignorance or correct knowledge?

It becomes clear shortly after I've told you, and you've taken on the wider perspective. ;-)

> Q: What if you don't care about being better or worse than someone else? If I am the worst of the worst, but I get consistent and reliable results, what have you to say about that?

It's not about being "better or worse". It's about have a greater understanding of your process by not taking on the misunderstandings of others.

You don't judge the experience. It is an empty experience. Recognising that, is sufficient. Let's not do the "others" thing. It's the example of a process that's important. The apparent "who" is irrelevant.

No. There *is* no tell. It's just... imagery. There's nothing behind it. No inherent meaning at all. Pure subjective idealism, just as you (should) like it! ;-)

I don't think it *was* your point, though, right? I'm saying there is nothing *to* tell, nothing behind the experience. So even to talk of a result as arising from knowledge (correct or otherwise) is incorrect.

The short version: There's is nothing to believe about how things come to be. It's mechanical; it's residual patterning; it's free of meaning inherently except in its relation to other arising patterns.

"Mechanical" as in a process that does not to be guided. A "law" of subjective reality, as it were.

I understand what you mean when you refer to "belief". Although I've come around to thinking it's not a great word. Something along the lines of "background formatting" or "activated patterns" seems to capture it a little better. But - y'know - just language eh.

You get what I mean by "mechanical". That's why I put it in quotes. If you imagine owls, you later get owls. Not sure of a good term for that which doesn't have baggage (and after all, the way this happens *isn't* a mechanism other than it funnels through current accepted patterns).

I *think that* the idea of "belief" is quite restrictive in and of itself. What exactly is a belief? When you go looking for one, it's a vague image which contains a feeling. The "feeling of what is true"? The feeling that you hold onto which brings into presence all the patterns which have that feeling as part of their structure.

What I'm interested in here: What is it that's filtering "this stuff" not "that stuff". The idea of beliefs doesn't help describe that in itself.

> >Mechanical

Uh-huh. Again, I defined the usage: a process that doesn't need guided. Other words are "spontaneous" or whatever. Really, it's best to avoid calling it anything.

> > Q: It's that which you can't ignore even if you would like to.

Better to switch that around and say that it's the patterns which shape your experience. You don't so much "believe" things as *have beliefs*. Which sounds like wordplay, but it gets us away from the idea that beliefs are something you *do*.

> > Q: but intent uses concepts to structure itself.

Just for language, "intent" doesn't use anything - intention *is* the pattern. *Intending* would be triggering such a pattern into an active state. (Just translating for my own understanding.)

Let's talk about volition. You, I think, seem to have the idea that you are continually "doing" intent. Is that right? Whereas I see intending as something you do to change the pattern, as it were. Experience itself unfolds spontaneously.

Okay, I'd say "experience is an ongoing process" and that intending is the way we "set a new course" (by changing our "shape"). But that's just conceptual splitting.

What I dislike about that is it implies I am "maintaining" something, while I know in experience I am not.

There is no ongoing doing. I've checked. There *can* be ongoing interfering if you do that, but you don't need to.

No, the difference is that I see intention as a filtering pattern which "lets through" corresponding experiences. While in this sense it never "stops" - never stops having an effect - it doesn't need to be "maintained" while you are content with your direction.

Extra: I am viewing this from an "eternal" perspective, in that the intentional filter applies over all-time. It therefore also incorporates the apparent passage of time.

It depends on which level you slice it. But, in this view, your intentional pattern has "deterministically" defined the trajectory across the possible moments of experience, by filtering it. You will then experience the experiential patterns of that path.

I say "deterministically" but of course if you change the intentional pattern, a *new* deterministic path emerges. This is why you can have precognitive dreams and insights. With the current intentional pattern, the future is defined. However this does not interfere with your freedom because, so knowing, you can alter your pattern, to give you a new future.

It all exists (implicitly, if not actually extended) and so all information is available - although our per-moment 3D sensory formatting can fool us into thinking that's all there is. Of course, there are other ways to slice this - take your stand as "this bit" which navigates and alters the "rest of it". And that slicing is itself a free choice.

The trick is to go with the most flexible version, which I think is to adopt "the background" as your viewing position, have a static filter dictate what you're going to let through, on top of a time framework.

> Q: Is there a limit to how many times you can do this or when?

No. (Although there are more efficient ways.) It's like a 4D pattern that updates every time. Which is why adopting the approach to let things be except when you deliberately want a change is best.

Those who don't know, constantly accidentally re-pattern themselves, and therefore dilute their "power" to fragmentation. You *can* keep changing your intentional pattern all the time, just as you can keep editing a document forever. But if you want to actually "read" what you've "written", this is a bad idea. You never get a coherent narrative going, and you never sit back to actually enjoy the experiences you've cued up.

> A: I think what TriumphantGeorge is saying is that the state of not-intending is a state in which intention is dormant. I agree with you more, as I see the truth in the fact that even intending to let things play out is a... well, hang on. It's very tricky. To let things play out is a much smoother way of viewing it than claiming you are intending to not-intend. This creates an unnecessary recursive process that is useless to enter into. It works better to just frame it mentally the way TriumphantGeorge is, it allows you, rather, it allows me, to feel more at peace. Knowing intention as something that can be activated but then when not in use is dormant, to me is a better view than it being constantly in use.

> Q: So when you don't, you're continually signing off on your previous intent. Continually.

I know what you mean, but that doesn't involve intervention or activity. Here I'm talking about whether you actually have to *maintain* intention. The answer is no. How would you *like* things to be?

Do you envisage "control" as being something you are constantly *doing*, grasping the world and all its facts, holding them in place? Not very God-like, I'd say. Or would you rather be the calm background that effortlessly experiences all things arising in alignment with your last "command" - until you decide to issue a new "command", at which point the patterns realign accordingly, and subsequent experiences fall in line? I like the second one. At the very least, the second one provides the first one as an option. The other way around, not.

> Q: Are you involved in some situation? Yes, you are, at all times.

No, I'd say. Or more specifically: it's optional.

If you are not holding onto your emotional state (which is just another sense, part of the experience) then you aren't 'involved'. And without that involvement, that emotional re-triggering of patterns, then there is no effort, because each moment disappears immediately, as it should.

> Q: What you ordinarily consider as some clumsy and un-godlike strain is itself utmost purity upon final analysis.

A pointless analysis. Just as you can say "everything is consciousness, there are no obstacles really".

> Q: I think I've said that ultimately intent is effortless only about a dozen or more times. If you failed to notice that, then me saying it one more time will not help.

Everything is ultimately not even nothing, for sure. But that's not the experience you are having now, is it? *"But a significant effort may sometimes be required to turn around certain tendencies"*, you said. Really? Why?

Or by "intent" do you mean "wishing that"? Ineffectual wishing is effortless, is that what you're saying?

It's all every well to talk about the ultimate state, and how everything should be or "really is" optional because we're all Godlike. But if you look around your life and you aren't living that way, then it's just an idea. An idea you are hopeful might be true. Or just an idea you use for comfort, if you're too afraid to take the steps - delete the boundaries - and let everything flow in. I mean, it's lovely to talk theory and fantasy, but Oneirosophy is about lucidity.

> Q: You always undergo some experience. That experience is precisely your situation. Can you talk about a time when you don't undergo an experience? Not from experience!

Surely not, not, not? You don't "undergo" experiences and an experience is precisely *not* your true situation, right?

> Q: Your experience is not the entirety of the true situation because there is also infinite potential which isn't directly experienced, but which is necessary for experience to make sense.

I'd say what we call "experience" we mean "current sensory experience" or pattern?

Infinite potential is always here now, it's just been patterned into the current sensory experience (by which I don't mean just images, sounds, and so on, but the object-sense and also the global "feeling-sense" of it and "a world").

If you relax your hold on those, avoiding "re-imagining" them, we might say that infinite potential gets to "shine thought" - but really we mean that we haven't obscured the sense/actuality of open possibility by crumpling it up. So the more we become non-attached (basically, stop holding onto the feeling-aspect of the current experience, via narrow attention perhaps) the more flexible the world becomes, the more *next-moments* are available.

> Q: On the other hand, you could say that all experiences are sensed.

That is the approach I am using. If it is being "felt" in the aware space, it is part of my present moment experience. The separation into "senses" is another pattern, so that itself isn't a good definition.

> Q: Sure, I agree. That's the basic premise behind all renunciation.

What good about this view overall is that instead of people trying to renounce by taking action or saying stuff - all of which presupposes a person who can do something about their experience - it's much clearer what is actually involved: not-triggering, not-activating.

Okay. It's time to renounce the world. How do you go about it?

> Q: I just do what I like and accept all consequences. Or as one of my idiot friends who knew one or two good sayings said, "Pay attention. Take responsibility." Same thing.

See, that's not how I think of it. I mean, how - right now - do you (I mean "does one") become independent of the world's momentary whims? Do apparent events move you emotionally, affect your mood? Then the world is happening to you and shifting you. That-not-being-the-case is what I'm talking of.

Again though, I mean more directly. Loosely, this about detaching, seeing sensation as floating and unbound, such that this-moment and next-moment are not bound to be continuous.

So what you say is the action equivalent, as it were.

Reply to “Teleportation thought experiment”

[[OP: I have a thought experiment with some questions that will help me better understand the concepts here. You've got two people having experiences in the same reality. Let's call them Al and Britt. Al is an avid meditator, lucid dreamer, and lately has been attempting teleportation after reading up on posts in /r/Oneirosophy . Britt is a concerned friend that is worried that Al is becoming a new agey nutjob.

One day Al decides to attempt teleportation, and tells Britt about it. Britt, being a caring but skeptical friend, decides to sit in on the session. So they sit down in a room and Al attempts to teleport to another reality. Al gets closer and closer to teleportation, and then he succeeds. What does Al experience as he teleports to the other reality, and what does he experience after?

Now for the kicker: What does Britt experience as she watches Al teleport from her reality, and what does she experience after?]]

> Q1: Since Al is having a subjective experience of teleportation I imagine that Britt would continue to objectively view Al's body as present though his consciousness may take leave during his experience. Pessimistically this could be viewed as Al being incapacitated in some sense from Britt's perspective which would further strengthen Britt's resolve *and* Al's resolve (assuming that he hasn't become comatose and did indeed return with some information regarding his experience). Either way I'm not certain what proof could be given by Al to quantify his subjective experience. The idea of physical teleportation necessitates some objective or material occurrence in order to be validated by the objective observer. That is to say something or someone (Al in this case) must necessarily move from physical location A to physical location B. If a person is able to leave the body and retain consciousness the casual observer would be none the wiser though the observer/teleporter would have an experience to report upon successful return. I don't know if any of this helps but I've seen some shit and I don't like to discount anyone's personal experiences no matter how outlandish they might seem initially.

> Q2: No, this isn't right at all. What each of them experiences has nothing to do with moving between physical locations. If Britt experiences Al as staying exactly where he was or if Britt experienced Al vanishing into thin air, neither necessitates Al has actually moved through physical space. Britt can't "objectively view" Al as having done anything at all. Al might appear incapacitated and he might not, but no "consciousness" has left his "physical body" and "gone" anywhere.

> Q1: So if we're throwing subjective vs objective experience out the window, what happens if Britt decides that Al is a total nutcase and makes a welfare call for Al to have him get evaluated?

You just *can't talk about* an objective view at all. Whenever you find yourself thinking about a situation in the 3rd-person... stop. There's no such thing. *All* there is, is private experiences.

We might hypothesise that each private experience draws from the same eternal "shared resource" of experiential patterns, dissolved into the background of consciousness, but there is no sense of a shared *environment* in space and time. (The world is not a place.) Space and time are *part of experiencing*, they arise together-with an experience, but do not exist beyond it. In fact, that's why strictly speaking we can't even talk

about there being multiple subjective experiences - because there's no such thing as "multiples" or counts anymore, beyond the experiencing of it.

All this becomes obvious when you examine your own conscious unbounded space in which your experiences arise, and try to conceive of "another" consciousness that could be: a) distinct, b) located elsewhere, c) related in time.

No such thing as a subconscious space. Even by "unbounded space" I just mean "openness", because 3D-space is part of the experience that arises. Everything there is, is here and now.

If you want a way to think of the subconscious, you could envisage it thus:

- *All* possible experiential patterns are present right now in your consciousness.
- The patterns differ in the extent to which they are "active" or "triggered".
- Your current sensory ("conscious") experience is simply the "brightest" of the patterns.
- Your "subconscious" is the other patterns, all triggered to various lesser extents.
- You can think of this like the sun in the daytime sky: the other stars are still there, they are just obscured by the brightness of the sun.

Yes, non-locality happens all the time, mainly because you (as consciousness) never are anywhere in the first place. Places appear in you, not the other way around. So, if you are experiencing this room and simultaneously have a thought about something, then that is two patterns of reasonable brightness becoming dominant:

1. Your sensory experience of "where I am".
2. Your sensory experience of "this thought".

The two are the same sort of thing really. "Where I am" is just a particularly bright, 3D-immersive, stable thought.

Swap "this thought" for "this other location" and you've got a non-local experience. Commit to it completely until it's brighter, more immersive and more stable than the "where I am" thought and... you've suddenly teleported.

[...]

Except the so-called ostrich is in fact actually the sand - and is only *imagining* a head and *hypothesising* a body...

Reply to “How do you understand/experience lucidity?”

So, for me lucidity is what happens when you no longer hold on to attentional focus. At that point, it relaxes out (and mostly dissolves) and your *context* changes. You stop being focused or narrowed on any one thing, so you don't confuse yourself with anything, and you're more aware of how things unfold. The 'solidity' goes away and you realise that sensory experience isn't "the actual world" - at best it's *about* the actual world (you).

'Real life' and 'dreams' are seen to be the same. 'Real life' is just "about" one aspect of the world, 'dreams' are about another aspect, 'thoughts' are just shadow sensory experience and the difference is only intensity and persistence. It also becomes much clearer that intention is therefore global (all consciousness; first-level formatting: all time and space), even though our sensory experience is just attending to one part (one time and place).

Reply to “What are some of the implications of personhood having no substance? I'll talk about how I understand this.”

I would maybe offer one thought:

> Q: In fact, in this very moment, just how many Nefandis live in this very body?

If we were being more precise, might we instead ask:

- "How many Nefandis (conscious perspectives) are accessing the *experience* of being *that* body in *those* circumstances?"

Because Nefandi isn't "in" a body, it's really that a particular experience has taken shape "within" Nefandi, or rather *what-Nefandi-really-is*.

And that answer would be, any or none - because (to use a poor analogy) the number of viewers watching a TV show is not limited by the show itself, only the number of viewers.

An extra answer would be, infinite - because an individual moment of "being a body in the world" exists outside of time. The number of "experiencings" of that moment over all eternity would be uncountable and, essentially, simultaneous.

I'm referring to "at time of broadcast" here, to be clear. (The show itself was never made, in a sense it has always existed.)

But then, as the next version of the answer clarifies, since this is outside of time or at least there is no relationship in time - there is no "George watched and *then* Nefandi watched it" - every program will "eventually have been / has been" seen by everyone.

The additional part would be, there aren't any "ones" either because it doesn't make sense to talk of two consciousnesses when they cannot be distinguished between. But that's more something that can't be talked about.

> Q: So because we know we can switch, of course we subtly know more than what meets the eye.

Yes. In more practical terms, there is no distinction *in type* between being able to conceive of something and experiencing it. If you can think of something, then it can become an immersive experience. To know that a TV show exists is to be able (in principle) to be able to seek it out and watch it.

> Q: Just because time is endless doesn't necessarily mean you get around to watching everything possible.

Yeah, I always try to tread carefully here. More specifically, I'd say that "every program" that has been conceived of does logically exist (simply be definition). It has therefore in a sense been "seen" (thought of) - but that is not to say it has been "watched" (been adopted as an immersive experience).

This is a little hard to talk about because in discussing it we imply an objective view - a space in which "every program" exists. But in truth it is more claustrophobic than that; it's not *any* program, it's every program that

is logically implied by the current state. You can't "see outside" of that - for the attempt to do so creates an "inside" by implication.

Agreed with all. All things are here, now, just in relative states of brightness, different levels of contribution. One's present experience is then the total of all prior "observations" to the extent that they remain active/bright.

This understanding is where the hope for deliberately directing one's "reality" comes from - diminish so-called previous observations, introduce new ones, and so on, to "rebalance" reality or simply assert a new pattern. Importantly, it means that the *next-moment* need not have any logical causal connection with the *now-moment* - other than that one has conceived of it.

> Q: Prior, future, and parallel. :) Not just prior.

Aha, well quite!

So, that's the interesting area: emotional readiness for discontinuous change. I'd equate that "readiness" with a willingness to release a hold on the current experience almost completely? So, if for convenience we maybe think of "emotional state" as being a collection of bodily sensations, then the only states you will be able to shift to are states which also contain those bodily sensations. No happy states while you are holding onto your sadness, to pick a clumsy example.

[...]

Since it seems relevant to the "multiple experiencing" aspect, and it's the closest I've got to writing a description of world-sharing in metaphor:

The Hall of Records

Imagine that you are a conscious being exploring a Hall of Records for this world. You are connecting to a vast memory bank containing all the possible events, from all the possible perspectives, that might have happened in a world *like this*. Like navigating through an experiential library. Each "experience" is a 3D sensory moment, from the perspective of being-a-person, in a particular situation.

And there may be any number of customers perusing the records, and any number of customers examining a particular record. So this is not solipsism: Time being meaningless in such a structure, we might say that "eventually" all records will be looked-through, and so there is always consciousness experiencing the other perspectives in a scene. At the same time, this allows for a complex world-sharing model where influence is permitted, because "influencing events" simply means navigating from one 3D sensory record to another, in alignment with one's intention.

This process of navigation could be called *remembering*. Practically, this would involve summoning part of a record in consciousness and having it *auto-complete* by association. This would be called *recall*. You can observe something like this "patterned unfolding" occurring in your direct conscious experience right now. You are not even the person you are experiencing, you are simply looking at this particular series of event-memories, from this particular perspective. "Reality-shifting" means to decide to recall a memory that is not directly connected to this one.

Reply to “Dreams, Subconscious and the Goetia”

In subjective idealism, all demons are "you". As is everything else you experience. (Using the word "thing" is perhaps slightly problematic, since it is often taken to imply an "out there" spatially extended place with objects in it, that are "happening and unfolding in time, but we'll let that pass.)

So you can make up anything you want and have it behave however you want, potentially. If you choose to imagine that there are demons and they do such things, then you will have experiences "as if" that is true.

You'd have to actually *define* what you mean by "subconscious" and "greater collective subconscious" to go further than that, within a larger context.

Here, I would suggests that "subconscious" is just a word for all logically sensible patterns which are activated to a greater or lesser degree within your perspective. "Conscious" is the brightest pattern at this moment, obscuring the other patterns (think: the sun shining in the daytime sky, obscuring the stars but the stars are still there). "Greater collective subconscious" would mean all patterns in logical space, full stop (think: all possible locations in the sky where a star *could* be).

> Q: [have it behave however you want.] Not if you imagine it has some independence or free will.

I would count that as part of the original "imagining" though. You should be careful and specific, definitely.

Certainly, once you've set something in motion, it can (apparently) be operating under its own steam. Although I would view this as the pattern of that thing being overlaid upon subsequent experience. The problem is that this happens "by implication" or association.

For instance, you summon a particular Greek hero for his strength and wit, knowing it's "all you", but forgetting that doing so also triggers all the associated patterns, and you subsequently find your music tutor dead with a lyre embedded in his head.

Reply to “Can abstract dualistic matter exist?”

> [[OP: I'm reading through the Three Dialogues and got past the bits about the impossibility of abstraction, but I didn't feel like I grokked it, or that abstraction was given due diligence. I also feel like matter is too often dismissed in the book simply because the sensory experience of it is contingent on the mind.
>
> Let's pretend that we live in a dualistic universe. Let's pretend it's just you, me, and a single other piece of matter to observe. To really simplify things, the only thing that we can observe is this piece of matter, and we can't observe it from other perspectives... because we're tied to rocks in Plato's cave.
>
> This piece of matter works like a function of both its own properties and the properties of the observers. When the piece of matter is observed from my perspective, it outputs a "0" and I experience that "0". When it's observed from your perspective it outputs a "1" and you experience a "1". So our experience of this dualistic object is contingent on our own mind, as well as its own spooky properties.
>
> This is analogous to me and a dog looking at a rainbow, and each of us seeing different colors.
>
> I know nothing about the structure of this matter, except that it imposes consistent sensory experiences on an observer relative to its own properties and the properties of the observer's mind. f(own_properties, observers_properties) = experience!!!!
>
> Isn't there about as much reason to suppose this matter exists as there is that our sensory experiences are contingent on a greater god-mind?]]

I'd say your story already begs the question; it presumes the existence of something and then creates an image based on that something, in an attempt to prove or disprove it. Some thoughts:

- In what way do we ever experience matter?
- How *exactly* would the boundary between matter and mind be breached? How would they interact with one another?
- How can something have properties other than those that arise in experience? Where do those properties exist?

Certainly we can *conceptualise* additional objects and patterns and properties to form an explanatory link between observations, but they belong to mind and arise in experience too, and don't belong to some external thing (except as the *concept* of "an external thing"). In other words, matter "exists" only as a fictional story to connect sensory experiences. Unwitting reification of abstractions is one of the worst habits we can have. The additional part is that what we call "observations of objects" are themselves collections of ideas and their extended patterns.

[...]

A Reformulation

Perhaps you should reformulate your question, which is in fact:

- "Is it possible for me to have experiences *as if* there was such a thing as matter?"

  The answer is, "yes".

Then you should ask:

- "Does that mean there exists such a thing as matter, other than my conception of it?"

  The answer is, "no".

One of the problems with personal experience is that it has the property of aligning with our current worldview. The fact is, that if you adopt almost any philosophical position, you will start to experience the world *as if* it were true. Only by personal experimentation can you demonstrate this to yourself. If you genuinely adopted the notion that only mind exists, your thoughts and experiences would quite quickly fall into line with that view. But that makes us ask: what is the "real, essential truth" then?

The Truth(s)

For the sake of discussion, and simplifying by division, we might say there are three types of truth:

- ***Direct Truth*** - The immediate experience you are having right now, without analysis. The only definite fact is the content of your experience at this moment.
- ***Conceptual Truth*** - The is the 'truth' of having a self-consistent conceptual framework which we use to describe the world. This does not necessarily have many contact points with direct truth; it can be a 'castle in the sky'. The more contact points, though, the better.

Since the content of *direct* experience is changing all the time, and content of *conceptual* experience is arbitrary, then neither can be the fundamental truth. The absolute truth must be unchanging.

- ***Absolute Truth*** - The only definite truth is that experience is being experienced. In other words, that you exist and "are". Essentially, this is consciousness. It is the only certainty.

So all truths apart from this one will in fact be relative truths. "Matter" is a conceptual truth, a self-consistent framework, but one with minimal touch-points to direct truth because it supposed an external view beyond what is possible to experience directly. There are in fact many ways a world can conceptualised in any number of equally coherent ways. But none of those ways are "out there" in reality, they are "in here" in thought.

The Conceptual Question

Finally, let me suggest a way to tell whether a conceptual framework is approximating direct truth, rather than simply being a connective fiction:

- If when thinking of your conceptual truth, you see it from an objective, 3rd-person view, the "view from nowhere" - then you are immediately wrong, and all that your are imagining in that view is a complete fiction disconnected from direct reality.

It would be an interesting exercise for you to pause right now, and think about "matter" and how it interacts with personal experience. Probably you have some sort of vague imagery that appears in your mind at that point, perhaps a little illustration or diagram or example.

You should write down a description of that imagery.

[...]

[[AesirAnatman: Here's an argument against matter:

- There are no properties that are not experiential in nature.
- A material thing must be discerned from a non-material thing according to certain properties.
- A material thing's properties are subjective and experiential in nature.
- The materiality or non-materiality of a thing is internal, like being blue or not blue, rather than external.
- Therefore, matter is not external, and is not matter as usually understood in terms of a externally real, self-existing substance. "Matter" is just a collection of internal properties (i.e. beliefs and experiences): stability, predictability, etc.

Therefore, **matter as usually understood does not exist.**]]

The problem is of types. How can "green" interact with "acceleration"? How can "matter" interact with "mind"? For two things to interact, they must have a commonality.

That's the essence of the idealist argument against duality.

What do you mean "who am I"?

I'm simply presenting the common argument that is used, the logic supporting that position. The basis is that anything that has ever been observed interacting has had a commonality.

If instead of "interact" we say "push against one another" then it becomes clearer. Only things which share a common property can push against one another, otherwise: what is pushing against what?

(If there is no commonality, then you have to propose an intermediate processes which contains aspects of both and acts as a bridge between the two - but then you have implied there must be an additional type which underlies that, something which underlies mind, matter and the bridge.)

So we end up eventually with the idea that matter must have a mind-aspect or mind must have a matter-aspect. Since we only ever observe mind, then it would seem that matter must have a mind-aspect. Furthermore, since we could never observe a non-mind-aspect of matter, it exists only in our concepts. Effectively them, observable matter = mind. Hence, there is only mind.

The short version is: Anything you can't directly experience, is something you are inferring, and cannot prove the existence of - you can only demonstrate the *usefulness* of it as a fictional concept.

The even shorter version: Matter is not impossible, but it *is* perhaps pointless!

I reckon that if we keep going at it, what we'll discover is that we do agree entirely, it's just that we're cutting up the world differently; our experiences are the same, we're just categorising them into parts in different ways. :-)

To wrap up a couple of stray points and go around one more time for fun:

- I'd suggest that in order to recognise that two things are affecting one another, a commonality has *by definition* been established of some sort. Even if that commonality is simply that they are (say) both "patterns in consciousness" in the same way as there is commonality between "folds in a blanket".
- We can have commonality without cause and effect. In fact, I don't believe cause and effect is a very good model; I think it's better described as an account with partial observations of a larger pattern, etc.

We probably have to define what we mean by "exist" to get any further. It does depend on the level at which we're talking. If I'm saying matter is essentially a concept to us, does that mean matter doesn't exist or cannot exist? That's a reasonable question. (The other was "does it matter?", pun-fully, which speaks to my short version!)

Concepts do "exist" as concepts, as thought-patterns. And one could look upon our ongoing sensory experience as an "immersive thought". And so experiential patterns are themselves "concepts" or "collections of ideas" in Berkeley-speak.

So "matter" does exist as a concept-idea and one which is experienced *in a way*... but only in the same way as "a vase" exists and is experienced, which is only as a concept-idea... and which is associated with certain sensory patterns, which are also concept-ideas. And so on.

We are left with: okay, it turns out that everything exists at least as concept-ideas, so what are concept-ideas made from? And the answer is something like "awareness" or "consciousness" or "experiencing" or... *mind*.

So again we're back to a commonality, and to mind. But it's a commonality in the sense of different folds, as concept-idea patterns, belonging to the same blanket, as mind.

[...]

We should do something about the formation of objects at some point - I think that's the part of Berkeley which is most relevant to this. It's this apparent consistency (persistence of objects) which suggests a "something behind" experience to us, but in fact all that's really required to justify this is pattern-clustering and interconnection of patterns.

Yes, the apparent consistency is what's experienced, regardless of the explanation.

We then have:

- In materialism, it's explained by a persistent, stable external world which impinges on awareness. Usually the whole issue of consciousness is dodged, due to the bridging problem between matter and mind. We simply assume that consciousness will be emergent from matter somehow.
- In *some* types of idealism, it's explained by a larger mind in which patterns are held and impinge on sub-minds. This involves a type of externality, but there is no bridging problem since "all is mind".
- In subjective idealism, we no longer have a larger mind and constituent sub-minds. There is simply mind which we might say has *taken on the shape of* patterns. There is no externality at all. The patterns are what is "real" and "objects" are illusions.

Of course, drawing the line of "what is real" is then pretty arbitrary. All that's really real is consciousness itself and the shaping into patterns; that which the patterns form are relative truths only.

Objects then *emerge* as interlinked patterns through activation and feedback - just as if I gave you a series of photographs with some commonality, you might infer they were images of the same "target" from different angles, and exposure to those images would establish within you a pattern, such that subsequently the arising any one of those images again would trigger within you the whole set, which you would experience all-at-once as an "object".

However, *there is no actual object* as the source of the patterns in our case. Simply a set of patterns which happened to be active at the right moment, which subsequently become clustered, and become brighter than the rest of the noise, such that a stable "world-pattern" gradually becomes established, more as a set of habits than an actual reality, a collection of regularities, which we come to call "objects". (This is Berkeley's "collections".)

Anyway, something for a later post I think.

There are quite a few variants! Idealism alone just solves the problem of "stuff". There's then all the issues of how the world persists, *if* the world is actually persistent, whether the world is a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time", *if* the world is a place at all, and so on.

Reply to “The Mental Tendency of Preferring Multiplayer”

In discussions elsewhere about subjective reality and influencing reality, a concern that comes up again and again is that doing so implies that other people won't be "real", or at least not independent. (The other version is where it's assumed that they are "real" now but that the act of making change will mean they won't be the *same* people afterwards.)

This "peopleness" issue might well be one of the main problems for accomplishing unusual things, and explain the "urge to forget" that occurs after spontaneous unusual experiences. For instance, witnessing objects vanish and reappear may seem like a small glitch of no consequence - but in the back of your mind you follow through the implications: that the world is not solid, stable, reliable, but instead flexible, randomised and arbitrary. If that can happen to objects, then it implies that perhaps any *fact-of-the-world* at all could change on a whim, including those relating to people.

Maybe this is why it's often only under extreme and desperate circumstances that reality-shifts are experienced.

The world is dead independently of us, only we breathe life into it. Perhaps this is a fear of loneliness? Perhaps that's why we invented a world with imaginary friends in the first place?

> > OP: One of my earliest experiences with anything I'd call oneironautical was meditating in a dark room after having eaten four grams of dried *Gymnopilus luteoviridis*. The hallmark of the experience was an overwhelming, metaphysical, inescapable sense of loneliness. It was like masks had been pulled off of everyone I'd ever known (or could ever know) and they were all just reflections of my self, devoid of any -genuine- otherness. And that devastated me to such a degree that I decided, "There's a very good reason I decided to be a human. Realizing you're It is not fun. It's way more fun to be a human." And I stopped meditating or doing drugs or contemplated anything important for... months, definitely. Maybe upwards of years.
>
> I wasn't ready for that at all. And it didn't just mean that I wasn't open to that realization. It pushed me, repelled me backward, stunted my progress, took me out of the game for a long time.
>
> Cultivating your sensibilities, molding your desires and tendencies, and learning how to subtly establish your own, internal sense of validity (i.e. some kind of ultimate Otherness is not necessary for something to be just as valid as you feel it to be right now) is one of the absolute most important aspects of spiritual progress IMO. Maybe *the* most important.

I think /u/3man had a similar drug-related experience, but it was more of the sort of a character telling you how it is; he felt the potential horror of everyone just being our puppets too. Can't find the link right now.

Yes, I think that having a right worldview, and a shifted perspective of what "meaning and purpose" are, is required before being fully exposed to this.

For instance, many people's response to the oft-banded theories that "this is a simulation" is that it would make their lives pointless. Similarly, people who accidentally have lucid dreams and just wake themselves up because "it's just a dream". They rarely seem to interrogate the underlying assumption, the assumption that things "being made from atoms" is somehow inherently more meaningful than things being made from information or dream-stuff. Are solids more meaningful than gases? Are rocks more meaningful than oxygen?

If a person hasn't addressed these things, then even straightforward philosophical idealism will be problematic for one's identity.

[...]

> [cosmicprankster420: To me the whole point of oneirosophy and lucidity is to have the freedom to create any kind of experience you want for yourself not to come to some ultimate realization that this is all some kind of solipsistic nightmare that we are trying to forget. You are making the mistake of assuming there is some kind of ultimate reality, but the way I see it is that neither the realm of otherness or the realm of just me ness are ultimately real. To say that one realm Is the real one and one is illusory creates a kind of objectivity because in order for something to be real something has to be unreal and vice versa. I was definitely going under the solipsism trip for awhile but I then realized if everything is subjective and not ultimately real then solipsism isn't real either.
>
> I think what our mental tendency actually is, is having a kind of foundational primary worldview in which everything stems from. To me being an oneirosopher is about being a kind of metaphysical nomad moving effortlessly from one type of dream to another via there lucidity and if you are stuck in one type of dream like atheism, Christianity, or the case of solipsism then you have actually lost some of your lucidity. It is realizing that if nothing is real then nothing is unreal either.
>
> The idea that everything is lifeless hologram under your control is no more or less valid then a world of otherness and others the former is simply more practical when it comes to controlling things. But if we say that one type of experience is real (being the only thing that exists) and one type of experience is unreal (there are other independent minds out there) then we are actually disempowering ourselves in terms of creating the types of dreams we want because what if we really want to create a dream where other independent minds exist, if everything is just us are we not able to or allowed to create that kind of dream? That's limitation to me paradoxically.
>
> I think instead of trying to come to some ultimate realization we need to learn how to switch back and forth at will from these perspectives because both the everything is me perspective versus the there are things independent of me perspective both have their own uses, but we should be very careful about fully commiting ourselves to one dream to the point that we forget we have a choice.]

Yeah, the only "ultimate realisation" is surely that there is no fixed truth in terms of content. No content-based realisation is ultimate.

I think people sometimes confuse "nothing is real" with saying that experience is hollow, that there's no *aliveness*. But that's misinterpreting it as " 'nothing' is what is real", that reality is nothing. In fact, if you-as-consciousness is shaped into the experience of being a body in a world with other people, then all of that *is* alive, is intelligent, formed from your aliveness and intelligence.

So oneirosophy becomes the recognition of the ability of *whatever-you-are* to take on the "as if" experience of *any* relative truth.

Reply to “Subconscious mind is helpful and problematic for the same reason.”

On the "effortless" thing:

...the way in which things are "effortless" is more in the sense of alignment of intention, lack of tension cause by asserting contrary states, and the *sign* of this alignment is effortlessness. Like the alternative term "non-doing", it is easily misunderstood as meaning not participating at all; people think "it happens by itself" is a sign to wait around, because you can't easily describe intending. [1]

Practically speaking, it is meant as a description of using end-state intention and allowing-unfolding, rather than simultaneously intending the end-state while reasserting the state-state or intermediate states.

The common examples are intending *being-standing-up*, while intending the process *getting-up-from-sitting* (creates conflict). Or trying to solve an intellectual problem by intending *it-being-solved* while continually revisiting the *it-being-a-problem* state, and so never letting the pattern make the transition.

Unfortunately, it (effortlessness and non-doing) really doesn't make a lot of sense to someone until they've had the experience, like a lot of the things we discuss here.

[1] Although actually, if you use the patterning description of experience, you can lead people to be able to assert end-states using their imagination in a way that makes sense and can be discussed. You can lead them to non-doing, although in my experience in most cases it has to be done in person, as you kinda feel your way through the explanation.

Remember: The universe is dead. Only you are alive. All time is now. It is you who scan your attention across the pre-existing moments.

When you intend something, the update is immediate: it is immediately true, incorporated into the pattern of the world. Your attention just hasn't got to that moment yet. So the reason to accept and know that "it is done" is because that's the truth, and so you don't then *re-update* the world into another state through further meddling due to doubt.

Literally, everything that arises in your awareness is a *direct interaction* with the world, *as* the world. Passing thoughts indicate the current state of it (they *are* it). Deliberate intentions-thoughts *define* the current state of it.

You might find the *All Thoughts Are Facts* comment and its parent a useful summary.

Reply to “Dreaming Versus Being Awake”

Have you ever had a lucid dream (a dream in which you realise you are dreaming)? Then you are not even a zombie; you are fully aware and can manage the dream accordingly.

I'd say that waking and dreaming realities are on the same level. They are not in fact "realities", just parallel sensory experiences. Right now, you are in a room, reading this. Now, think about the room next door...

This room remains vivid but "with" it is now a shadow image of the next room. The only difference between the two is in terms of intensity and stability. If you could make the *next-room* sensory pattern more intense than the *this-room* sensory pattern, you would be in the next room...

It's remarkably hard to hold onto as a direct insight, rather than just as a concept - because any attempt to do so, loses it.[1] This is why I've been advocating that "letting go of control of attention" is the vital ingredient. We usually focus on letting go of our thoughts and our bodies, and yet still unwittingly "deform" our experiential space by manipulating "attention".

In fact, you shouldn't interfere with your *attention* at all, as conceived of as a narrowing down to certain objects in space. Rather, you want to use *activation* of desired images - in other words, intend to make a pattern dominant.

I've been injecting the related ideas elsewhere to see how they take with other people coming from a different place, without the "baggage" of previous metaphysical thought. (So, ahem, please resist the urge to "contaminate" them, so to speak.)

[1] This makes senses of course; you can't hold onto "open attention" by narrowing your attention!

The essence is: "attention" is completely the wrong way to look at it. There's no such thing as attention, as in a "positive" thing, except as a concept. It's a concept which leads to a poor intention. Indeed, there is no such thing as "open attention" (apart from a concept) because it corresponds to an absence of something. The absence of deforming experience rather than triggering it.

For as long as you try to use attention to interrogate the experience of simultaneity of thought (of the room now, of the next room, of your shopping list) you disturb it.

> Q: In my view there is nothing to disturb. All is false, not just some! Therefore, we play as we want to.

Yeah, but that's just tedious and useless, like saying "all is consciousness". The fact is, when people try and use this stuff - to "play as they want to", as you put it - they unwittingly use things like concentration and attention to do so, which actually works *against* their efforts.

Most people don't get how to imagine, that it's "taking on the shape of" thoughts, and "attention" is one of the sneakiest ideas going around. People genuinely don't realise that attention is effectively a locking down of what you are focusing on. They try to relax by using their attention; they try to dissolve and forget things by using their attention. All in the aid of "playing as they want to".

> Q: This suggests experience has a correct form that we're fucking up somehow.

It doesn't have a correct form, but each of us might have a desired from. And "attention" is something that can block our transition to the desired state, even as we try to use it to get there.

> Q: This isn't a bad thing when it happens, and it's not always locking down. There are different kinds of attention. There is acidic attention, which melts whatever it turns to. There is approving attention, which fortifies whatever it turns to.

Narrowed attention always locks down. The "other kinds" of attention are actually intention. There's a subtle difference between "bringing to the fore" in awareness such that it dominates the moment, with the intention to accomplish something (melting!), and attempting to contract space down to the target.

"Attentional focus" (concentration) is not necessarily the same as "attending to something" (having that be the dominant image or pattern).

Although very quickly here we're going to have trouble with language, because people's idea of what "concentration" is does vary. Those who "focus" by contracting space to the object, vs those who "focus" by allowing it to fill the space.

> Q: For most people agency is part of that desired form. We don't want to be (or feel like) passive TV watchers, guests to our own experiencing.

Agency or "the experience of agency". Because the experience of agency isn't agency; it's just another experience. It's second cause and it's a fake, like when people generate muscle tension prior to moving their body, because "that's them 'doing' the movement".

> Q: Consider too that you might deliberately want to make use of this "locking down" feature of attention. So even assuming attention had such a mechanical quality (I don't agree), it would still be useful! Once you achieve a desired state, you'd want to lock it down for some time. So even from your perspective narrowed attention wouldn't be a universally bad kind of attention.

Attention isn't the way to do this - simply *declaring* state-stability is the way to do this. Maintaining narrow attention is to fight against all change, you start getting pretty tense as your whole experience starts trying to cram itself into the compressed space you've created.

Which is not to say it has no use - it's even useful just for a raw experience of "playing with the shape of your space" - but I don't think it's a great way to do those things.

Experimenting is the only way to tell though.

> Q: To try to avoid a natural movement of attention is unnatural and wrong. Sometimes you want to narrow your attention. Why block it?

This is exactly my point - let it run free! But then you contradict yourself. You shouldn't be narrowing or expanding it *yourself*, you should instead by intending and there rest of it "just happens".

> Q: You've saddled attention with some very unhelpful features by declaring them to be so. And now it is so for you. Sad.

Heheh. Well, I think I've distinguished between the variations: attending as object taking dominance ("summoning an experience into awareness"),and attention as contracting and narrowing space (due to a misunderstanding arising from words such as "concentrate" and "focus").

The difference we're having is...

You don't narrow your attention at all by "doing" it. The *apparent* focusing of attention is a side-effect when we allow a particular object to dominate our experience. The problem arises when we try to *make* this happen by inferring a means ("focusing") and using those means to get the result. We feel we have to "do something" to get the result, and so mangle it up and create opposition.

Just as we get confused and think that we have to "do" the process of standing up - becomes aware of our sitting position, move muscles into position, etc - when in fact we should simply bring the *desired result* to mind.

There is no process to this, and the attempt to experience a process introduces strain.

Obviously, if that's what people want they can do that - but in the main people are under the misapprehension they need to create the transition, but that is not the case, and attempting to do so actually *opposes* the transition.

When you just want a result...

Rituals are fine, it's only when the details of those rituals are in opposition to the desired result. Rituals can often let you do something that you maybe can't persuade yourself otherwise.

This isn't against "stepping stones" themselves, it's about having opposing intentions - intending one state while at the same time intending another.

But if you *are* going to climb the building floor by floor, I reckon you should intend each floor at a time - allow that to be your complete experience.

But life's about more than that...

I definitely agree with rituals and steps as a way to learn. After all, if you always go only for the end result, you might miss other pathways and opportunities! And, y'know, life's about experiences not just getting everything over with. I totally agree on aesthetics. The ways and the flourishes are part of the fun. Even if we could just teleport everywhere, we might still choose to take a walk in the woods, or enter a running competition, or do some rock climbing. Y'know, cos doing stuff does feel good.

The point I've probably been making is: If you want a particular experience, then summon that. There are no intermediates required though, so it's a choice. And - like you said earlier - freedom is all about choice, and part of that is knowing what you don't have to do.

> Q: So imo you should be very careful about what you say about attention.

This, actually, is the crux of the matter. What we tend to *want* from attention is to bring something into mind; how we often *do* it is by compressing the space down to that something - which turns out to be extra.

> Q: If you try to jump from A to D, but your mind is not emotionally and intellectually ready for that, your subconscious will block this attempt.

Good point. Acceptable stepping stones! Actually, magick's been all about this, right? Because it's hard to conceive of ourselves as the direct cause of all things, we nominate something else - an object, or even a word - as the cause, and invoke that. We create and assign power to a "technology" to do what we want.

> Q: Everything is good. All meat is good meat.

It's all just experiencing! Even "bad" experiences will be, from a certain perspective, just fine.

Returning a little to what we were talking about before about attention, with reference to the Imagination Room metaphor, I'd say that if we...

- Assume that what is desired is for a particular pattern to be dominant.
- If we are beholden to a "spatially-extended world" view, we will be inclined to try to somehow filter out the rest of the world in an effort to isolate that pattern. Since that view implies the world itself is kinda fixed, our only option is to compress our perception so that it includes only that pattern. This is like creating "walls" in the Imagination Room and then moving them to surround a particular pattern. (This is the misunderstanding and the uncomfortable result I'm trying to describe.)
- If instead we have the "unbounded imagination room" view, then we realise there is no spatially-extended world, there is just the current activated patterns. This leads us to instead trigger the desired experience into the room, *rather than assume an experience and try to then filter it down*.

The first method involves trying to narrow down an experience (narrow, bounded attention), the second involves no narrowing or bounding, we remain open and have the pattern arise within that openness?

On consequences, that's something we should explore. We can't be aware of all consequences in advance (I suggest) and maybe not even aware of what will be necessary for us to experience to get from *here* to *there*, so every act has to be one of abandonment?

> Q: It's like when you look at a mountain range and you feel how mighty and stable nature is, then you think how fickle and weak you are by comparison.

So why is the loan difficult to recall? Given that our power can never go away, and can never change in nature, the difficulty must arise from confusion. Two possible contributors. These things combined mean we don't realise our everyday power and so we don't even try:

- The first is: time. It apparently takes time to change the world in ways that are not fully habitualised. It is "easy" to move your legs or move a pencil; it is "hard" to teleport or change the location of a mountain. Because we cannot do something in a short time-frame we tend to think it as not being possible.

  In fact, we *do* get results constantly by this method: synchronicity. These seem like weird random coincidences though, because of the second point.

- The second is: being unaware of the mechanism. That simply holding a pattern in mind for a while will result in the same pattern appearing in the "external" world. And doing so with intention (which is really just a more specific thought, the addition of definition change) even more so.

There's also our conception of the world as filled with heavy objects. A "mountain" is a massive solid mass of earth and rock so how it could possibly be moved by decision alone? But in fact, a "mountain" is more like a couple of dimensionless facts (a shape, a location) and a floating semi-transparent picture.

To move a mountain you might have to "hold in mind" its change of location for some time, the first time, so ingrained is the habit of "mountains can't move". Although: the more you have accepted the notion of a transparent, depthless world the easier it should be.

> Q: In the second case [the Imagination Room] the world is completely internalized.

Saying "interalized" isn't quite right though, because there is no internal to that model. The room itself has no boundary; it is unbounded consciousness. All possible worlds are "in" it but the room itself (consciousness which is the-real-you) isn't anywhere.

It can take on the shape of *apparently* being you-and-a-separate-world *or* everything-is-in-mind, but those are both just different experiential views (which one can freely flip between).

Additional. If you were completely detached, then simply triggering a thought would overlay-combine that pattern into experience. Even *saying a phrase* would trigger the associated pattern into experience. This happens with synchronicity quite a bit anyway; but commanding a mountain to move and it moving! The question is: does it just move for you? We need to talk about the "world-sharing model" here.

> Q: [On magick and related]

Even if you *know* the deal, it's not necessarily easy to allow such a transition. Just look at people's reactions to "glitch-like" experiences. Sometimes people get excited. More often they are frightened. But why be frightened just because a car suddenly vanished, or a person changed appearance? Because it means *anything at all could happen*. Even being healed from an illness is problematic. If you (say) allowed your life-threatening infection to just vanish overnight, what would be the larger implications of that? Reality would be broken (in terms of your previous notions of it).

You can make sudden transitions without having to go through a developmental process - after all, all that you're doing is learning to feel safe and let go - but it's effectively world-suicide so it's reasonable to not want to do it. You're not human anyway but you *are* having a *human-in-a-world* experience. That ends when you start altering literal landscapes. Or you memory-wipe. Or you account for it by saying it wasn't you that did it.

> Q: [The imagination room and internal/external]

I'm still not sure what you are referring to with "internal" there? In that view, the only thing I can see that could be labeled as internal is those patterns which are not currently "bright and dominant". The whole world-so-far is literally being experienced here, now (felt-sense) so there is no outside, or inside. There's just potentially categorisation. Although what I think you're getting at later - that there is no seeking for confirmation because you have direct access to "what is" anyway; it would be like asking for confirmation of your own thought - I of course agree with.

> Q: So if we were to grow disgusted and overly unsettled by the human body, that would hurt our state of mind. So these contemplative tools, contemplating the downsides, are powerful and dangerous and effective for all the same reasons.

And our contemplations, since they lead to a transformation of worldview, are reflected in our experience, including that of the body - which, after all, is *made from ideas*.

Interesting on the eyesight. I think I've shared this story before, but when 3D televisions first became available, lots of people reported interesting experiences. One guy had a girlfriend whose eyesight was terrible. When she was watching the 3D TV with him she became absolutely traumatised - because it presented the world to her in total clarity. She was confronted with it *being there* in miniature form, the distance inserted directly into her vision. She didn't *want* to see; she was accidentally-deliberately blurring the world out.

> Q: It's that which is within the POV. POV is a specific and partial manner of knowing, experiencing and intending.

Okay, so we're talking about the "everyday person" here rather than someone who has come to understand the revised view - in which although habitual imagery might be "as if" there is a perspective, you are actually the entirety.

In other words, the "individuality" is just a thought that is activated presently; you are never actually an individual, just as the TV screen isn't a particular TV channel.

> Q: All manners of experiencing have alternatives. No matter how enlightened you become and no matter how you revise your notions of body, personality, etc... it's all optional and you don't have to live like that.

I agree with this but...

> Q: So you remain, always, an individual.

I don't with this. In what sense are you an individual, except that you are not experiencing all possible thoughts at equal intensity at the same time? You may call your experience *being-an-individual* but the experience itself just consists of selected patterns.

Implicit here is that you are having an experience whilst in another location there is another experience - but that's surely not the case. Space and time are aspects of an experience; they are not available for there to be a "between experiences" or "separate experiences" beyond this.

You and I, for instance, are not experiencing each other at the same time - but equally, neither are we not. It's a case of "the context cannot support that idea".

> Q: In the sense that in distinguish yourself by your unique choices. You distance yourself from other options, and thus individuate.

Okay, although that is quite broad. That basically saying: I am "these thoughts" right now rather than "those thoughts". In fact, it's really saying "at the moment, these thoughts are brighter than these other thoughts; I identify myself with the brighter thoughts". There is no distance.

And the thoughts correspond to *a world* rather than to a person.

> Q: Conventional reality is an unconscious magickal assertion too, and it's groundless.

For sure, there is no fundamental ground [that is solid]. Like Narada and his Maya experience, it is all dissolved at any moment and revealed to just be sensory fluctuations and not even that. We live in a world - or rather, *as* a world - of "as if". But what use is freedom, if one is afraid to use it? Is it just the comfort blanket to make us feel better about our lack of courage? Could and should; I could do it any time I wanted, but won't.

> Q: It's even more subtle than that, because you don't have to identify with your thoughts.

You should identify with *all* of your thoughts - but not any one thought, and not their content.

> Q: You can have intellectual or emotional distance from something, for example.

But what, *exactly*, does this mean? It might not be an object which is located in this room, say, but it is a conceptual object that you have located in conceptual space. I suggest that emotional distance is a *literal* distance in imagination space, in the "parallel space" associated with that metaphor.

> Q: However when you attempt something you haven't done in you recent or any memory, you may feel doubts, and fear.

What is this a fear... of? Is all fear the the fear of annihilation, the fear of a transformation of the thought-pattern-concept that we have become identified with?

> Q: You can conceive of it that way, if you like. But is that what it really is? Or just a conception you find useful?

There are many ways to conceive of something, but (I suggest) there is no "really is" behind it. There are just different representations pointing at each other. Like George Berkeley's "objects as bundles or collections of ideas" - the "vase" is the superposition of all vase experiences and thoughts, and so on, and there is no "real vase" other than this.

"Reality" literally is a collection of interconnected metaphors "about" a fictional thing we call "reality"; the metaphors simply point to one another. A castle in the sky! Language is part of this too. If you talk in terms of "distance" then you are invoking a spatial metaphor; at the very least you have a "feel" of space between your designated location and an idea representing (and being part of) the emotion.

> Q: I don't think so. I think half of the fear is the fear of annihilation, and the other half is the fear of suffering.

Yes. Suffering - isn't that a fear of a change of the world, whereas the other side is a change of oneself? Same thing fundamentally, so the fear comes from the apparent division in both cases?

That's a matter of convention though. If one truly understood that both "the world" and "me" were merely particularly bright thoughts that hung around more than the others, would fear dissipate?

Certain traditions would have us believe so, certainly.

I guess I'm implying that true understanding = acceptance in this case. Otherwise you'd be fighting against the void.

Acceptance = forgetting, in a sense. It's allowing one thought (experiential pattern) to fully brighten at the expense of all others. Although this is a special "meta" case: it's accepting all thoughts.

[...]

[Nefandi: Well this was interesting. Just now I was relaxing and meditating. I was in a state between waking and dreaming, drowsy, but alert like a hawk on a hunt. For a second there I thought how weird it was that I was doing a meditation with a tongue touching the palate. Then I realized, wait, my tongue is laying at the bottom, flat. Then no. It's curved up and is touching the palate. This was so vivid too. I wasn't moving the tongue "physically." I was just focusing on it touching the palate and this would then become very vivid where for some moments it might as well have been touching. All the sensations were right for it. Trippy. Well, I'm awake now. The exercise is over. Which is to say, I am in a different dream now.]

Ah, nice. Like directly switching between states.

[...]

So the end result is always: you've selected an experience.

An alternative definition to try out: "attention" is bringing into awareness something that has already been experienced in the main senses ("already 'exists'"), "intention" is bringing into awareness something that has only been experienced in the shadow-senses ("only thought of").

> Q: Intention changes your felt-sense. Attention navigates around felt-sense.

Elegant. Can I add: "intending *is* the changing of your felt-sense"

> Q: Sure. Why would you even ask for a permission? Of course you wouldn't, because you're a Lord and a mage. Therefore you must be joking now.

It was a rhetorical question. And my answer was, unsurprisingly: "yes you can, and why don't you have some other cool things too".

[...]

> Q: Attention cannot be "narrowed" because it suggests it should be wider than it is now.

That absence of narrow attention is... *no attention*. But singe language dictates I need an opposite for "narrow attention" I called it "open" - note, I didn't call it "wide". Remember, I'm not saying there's anything wrong with having one object or detail fill your perception (*attending-to*, perhaps?), I'm saying that doing so by contracting your space or "concentrating" is problematic.

This is not actually easy to talk about; experimentation is the way. Most people I've encouraged to "stop narrowing" seems to like the result; it's like any attending and redirecting is effortless because you are no longer trying to experience the "doing" of it.

> Q: Sure, and if you weren't paying attention, how would you know this? :) Eh? Eh? Eeeehhh???

Haha, cheeky fucker! :-) But my paragraph above should help clarify.

> Q: [Experience of agency isn't agency] There is no difference between experiential and actual in our view. :)

But in this particular case, there's a point. I could phrase it better by saying: the *experiencing of apparently-causing* is not itself causal, because it is a resultant. The "feeling of doing" is always a result, a generated experience.

> Q: But you'll notice that even when people do this fake, something about this fake is not fake, since they still do move around! So there is truth in the fake. And fake in the true.

No. The "doing" is actually in opposition to the movement. It's like trying to stay still and walk at the same time. As soon as you stop trying to "do" in this way, everything becomes easy. It's tricky initially, because even the "thought of being in a position" triggers that pattern. So if you are sat down and want to stand up, you must avoid "thinking of being sat" or even "thinking of the process of standing" - you must leave all that alone and simply "think of being stood up".

> Q: Because any experience whatsoever, even the experience of not having any experience, is a fact of attention.

The point here is that one selects or brings-into-awareness by a "choice" rather than by manipulating the space in which experiences arise - which is a common error that people make (I have found). It's not really a philosophical point. It's a common practical habit borne of misunderstanding.

> Q: If you think "contracting space" is problematic, please explain what the problem is, exactly.

It is problematic if you are generating unpleasant results in addition to your desire. It's the equivalent of straining to read the letters on the screen by "concentrating hard", which doesn't help and in fact even works against you.

> Q: [the experiencing of apparently-causing is not itself causal, because it is a resultant.] I don't know if this is always true.

It's a matter of recognition. Incorrectly assuming that you need to "do this" in order to "experience that" puts you at a disadvantage. Of course, it also gets used in magical work: declaring that "this" has the property of "making this happen" and then using it accordingly. But being *aware* of that is important, to know that you are "dreaming" it into utility.

> Q: I think you're going overboard. You can't trick yourself like that.

It's not a trick; it's how this works fundamentally. As in the room example, "you can't be in two places at once" (let's put aside talk of actual bilocation). If you bring two opposite states to mind at once, you lock your experience. If you want to stand up efficiently, you must release the thought of sitting down and indeed any other position. By triggering the "being stood up" thought, your experience naturally flows to that.

This applies to more than just getting up out of a chair (which, after all, is an imaginary experience like any other)...

> Q: Right, but why should these two features bump into each other? You can do both at once!

They shouldn't but our use of language has, I've noticed, let to many people doing something they don't *knowingly* intend to do. This wouldn't matter so much, except that narrowed attention (reduction of experiential space, although not of awareness itself of course) leads to physical tension, lack of ease and fluidity in thought and creation, and a build-up of "stuck thoughts and incomplete movements".

> Q: You're saying "not until you stop focusing your attention will you experience magick." You're saying I have to be inflexible toward how I use my attention.

I definitely never said that (the first sentence). And the other is sort of the opposite of what I'm saying, which is: that narrowing of attention, *fixing* attention, *leads to* an inflexibility in experience, because it "locks" the patterns you are presently focused on.

Again, like the "triggering being-sat-down" and then trying to "trigger being-stood-up". Magick requires detachment, and this is at the heart of it: allowing patterns to dissolve back into the background (so to speak). Narrowed attention inhibits this.

> Q: That's true, but the way to unfuck them is to alert them, which includes alerting their attention to some heretofore ignored facts.

That's exactly what I'm doing. There's no point in messing about though; we might as well say: *if you are doing this then this is what's happening*.

Naturally, people must should against their own experience, and they don't need me to tell them to do so. Otherwise I'd be far more introductory and explanatory, right? (And I know *you* don't need cushioning!)

Although yeah I'm totally aware I'm bashing this stuff out quite "prescriptively" today. :-P

So, I'm describing the essence of it okay though? In all sorts of situations we end up creating an experience which is just extra clutter on the way to what we want, and even opposes it.

If "magick" works by bringing a thought into awareness and having it become the brightest thought (if you see what I mean), then introducing intermediate states actually just gets in the way of your desired result.

It's like you can fly to the top floor just by "wishing" it, but instead you end up interfering with that by "wishing" each of the floors between here and there. Which is great if you want the tour, but often we (by which I mean: me, often) don't realise that we can "skip to the end" - provided we don't think about those intermediary steps and thereby bring them into awareness...

Slowness might be desirable, savouring the experience - but I'm suggesting is that many people (myself in the past, and still now) unwittingly create *conflict and opposition* in their approach.

You know that I'm just *asserting* a conclusion so that you can bounce back on it though, yes?

It works with you, because you immediately pick a hole in things and we deconstruct the process, and take it apart in a way that's probably totally different to how it was put together - or rather, how I *think* it was put together, which often turns out to involve assumptions which I hadn't have spotted, because that's how good discussion plays out.

[...]

Hmm, interesting thoughts! More random poking...

> OP: What I think I was poking at, is the possibility that the subjective experience is merely some epi-phenomenum of some deeper non-conscious process.

But there is never anything other than subjective experience?

We might *imagine* some deeper process beyond consciousness, but we do that imagining *in* consciousness. That amounts to making "explanatory fictions" or stories, since we'll never actually experience supporting evidence (I suggest!).

> OP: You can test this by simply closing the eyes, or putting fingers in the ears.

Voids are a subjective experience also. But why would we expect closing our eyes to stop persistence? It is not a true void. A true void is absolute complete forgetting. What makes a world seem solid? That the images are vivid with well-defined lines and (key to most) that there is a sense of solid touch. But it actually doesn't matter how focused or fuzzy something is in terms of it being a subjective experience; it's just a subjective experience... *of fuzziness*.

A sharp dream (a dream of sharpness!) is just as much a dream as a fuzzy dream (a dream of fuzziness!).

> Q: If my subjective experience is everything, then that would have to include those voids - as the world seems to 'pop back' from them.

But you are still experiencing the world subtly!

It is tempting to say that our experience is sights-sounds-texture, but actually there is a whole complex *felt-sense* in the background. It is *this* which persists when we close our eyes and throughout our apparent movements in the world. The "current state of the world" is dissolved into this *felt-sense*. We are always actually experiencing everything. If it were to be dropped, then the world would completely restart - but you would never know it. And when, in this newly-born world, you went looking for memories, you would find them (on demand).

Probably the key to all this is to be clear about what "you" are. If you believe you are a "thing" looking out at a world, then all sorts of problems kick in. If you instead you observe that you are a "conscious open sensory space" in which experiences arise, one of which is *being-a-person-in-a-world*, then it's easier to see that all experience is subjective, no matter that its qualities.

Short version: A lack of imagery or a lack of sound is not a lack of subjective experience; it is a subjective experience that happens to lack imagery and sound. Even the experience of "open empty space" is itself a subjective experience.

I like the "SSSTT" thing! Hmm, so following on from that:

I see "time" as just the fading brightness of the most intense aspect of the ongoing sensory experience. That is, the "ongoing duration". 'The past" is then whatever residual patterns we've hooked onto the conceptual pattern we've got, a timeline say (basically just a retrieval concept we never quite release).

I see the *felt-sense* as the entirety of the world to date (in the largest sense). It's *all* dissolved in there and it never goes away. Because if it did, the world would restart.

There's a little thought experiment I played with a while back which is quite good for this. Turn off all your senses, what's left? You can get pretty much down to unlocated openness, although you still retain a sense of identity behind just consciousness. A feeling. If you switch off all the senses, the only sense left is the *felt-sense*.

The conclusion: You are *always* experiencing the entire world, right now, in every moment. Literally, sensorily experiencing it. And if you dropped parts, effectively forgot them completely, they would be gone forever.

My ordering: Open consciousness; sensory patterns within consciousness, evolving in intensity; some labelled "body" and "mind/thought" and "me", others labelled "world". All experience is subjective, to nobody.

The total sum of all your observations (intense-sensory and shadow-sensory), the accumulation of facts which are active, the current state of the pattern you call "the world". Your world right now is the culmination of all the experiences which have arisen in your consciousness space. The superposition of all patterns.

For the purposes of this, we might consider each instant of sensory experiencing to be "a fact". All facts will make sense in terms of previous facts (unless there is a deliberate intervention) because the pattern is one whole. The *felt-sense*, then, is the constant experiencing of that entirety in your consciousness.

Imagine that in addition to the SSSTT of this room, you also had a sense of the whole space and its contents all-at-once, like a unique dimensionless number you can "feel" that corresponds to this arrangement and has everything within it. Now have this include things that are out of sight. That, but for the whole world. SSSTTG, where "G" stands for "global".

To be clear, it's better to say that awareness "takes on the shape of" experience. So what's changed isn't awareness itself, but its content, its shape.

- Subjective experience is "made from" awareness; awareness is like a non-material material whose only property is *being-aware* and which takes on the shape of experience.

So the background feeling, all the accumulated experiences or patterns, like the sharks and the suncream and all the other facts and memories, that's the *felt-sense*. It's the "texture" of "you" in a way: it's the entirety of you-to-date, dissolved-enfolded.

The rush of old feelings is a memory-experience, unfolded. The room around you now is a sensation-experience, unfolded. If neither was present, if nothing was unfolded, there would just be that "texture" to the awareness-that-you-are. (If that texture faded, it would just be void.)

In the sun-stars-sky analogy: awareness is the daytime sky, the stars are the entirety of what has been experienced (*felt-sense* or G), the sun is the current experience (SSSTT). Actually the second T is the name for the fade-transition between different stars bring bright -> sun.

Experiment: When you "feel out" information within yourself you can see how it works. If you loosely placed your attention centrally in the body and assert something - e.g. "I feel great" - and allow the response to arise, you can see how a state unfolding feels, if you sit with it and let the resulting state information arise (responding with why you don't, probably).

Taking on a shape isn't a property, it's a capacity. Since it's not actually a material in the mechanical sense it has no properties at all (apart from *being-aware*). Even when it takes on the shape of something, it only *apparently* does so - in the same sense as a TV screen "takes on the shape of" people doing stuff in a world. It never really becomes people-stuff-world but it takes on a shape *such that* people-stuff-world are experienced.

[[OP: So we're talking about two separate things? The *awareness* and the *apparent shape*. I'm struggling to put into words that there's something up with your description of awareness. Ok I'll try.

Imagine I'm a being, whose only awareness is 'blue'. It doesn't hear, feel or experience anything other than blue. That blue is a single shade and intensity of blue, ever unchanging.

We can then choose to interpret this situation several ways:

1. There is an *awareness* that is only aware of *blue*
2. The *awareness* **IS** the *blue*.
3. There is no *awareness* or *blue*.

The first of these presupposes that the *awareness* is a thing separate from everything it is aware of. So the *awareness* is an actor, which has the capacity to experience, or act out the *blue*. The *blue* is not a thing as such, but a capacity the *awareness* has. I think this is your line of reasoning (?)

The second does away with the distinction. The *blue* does not exist without the *awareness* and vice-versa. In a sense we're giving two different names for the same thing - it's a problem of language use, not of subjective experience. This is my interpretation.

The last relies on the second being true and then does away with both the *awareness* and the *blue*. Since the only thing going on is *blue* there can be no *awareness*. To be aware of something, requires a comparison to be made between at least two different things. This is more *blue* than that. In other other words to be *aware* requires structure of some sort. Another way of putting it is that *awareness* needs a certain amount of *surprise* or *difference* or *information*. Without that, there is no awareness.

My experience tells me there's stuff going on, so there must be structure. So 1 or 2 holds true, not 3. But I believe in 2, since without the *taking on the shape*, i.e. the experience itself, there is no *awareness* (and vice-versa). The two are synonymous. So being aware can't have a singular property, it has (is) a multiplicity of *shapes* or *experiences* and nothing else. *Awareness* is not an actor!]]

The answer is: **all three.**

"I'm struggling to put into words that there's something up with your description of awareness."; And this is where the problem lies, as you later observe: language. In order to think about something, you have to split it into parts (concepts) and then arrange them relative to one another in mental space (a conceptual framework). You are doomed to create divisions in order to understand something intellectually!

So awareness is:

- The non-material material whose only property is *being-aware*, which takes on the shape of experience, and experiences itself relative to itself.

Which very quickly starts to sound like nonsense. We're having to create artificial divisions ("non-material material") in order to put it into language, when of course the next step is to collapse those divisions such that nothing can be said (" ").

"In other other words to be aware requires structure of some sort. Another way of putting it is that awareness needs a certain amount of surprise or difference or information. Without that, there is no awareness."; No, there is *always* awareness - there is always "being". If awareness has no folds in it, there is not *experience* but there is still *awareness*.

"Awareness is not an actor!"; No, because acting implies something which acts and something which is acted upon. Awareness, instead, *becomes*. When "it is raining" what is the "it"? It's an error of language! It would be more accurate to say "the world becomes raining".

I knew my sloppy language would come back to bite me! :-)

> OP: The awareness of 'being' as something that carries on without experience is at best an illusion. . .

It's not awareness *of* being. Hmm. Okay let's see if we can arrange this better. Let's begin with:

- There is "what-is", which I have been calling *awareness*.

  Other traditions call it "pure awareness". It isn't awareness *of* anything. It has no inherent division, spatially or temporally; it's that which such things are formed of. In a sense it is all that exists and it does not exist (because: relative to what?).

  We could think of it like a blanket of material that is aware of any folds within it. Lying flat there is no experience of folds - there is simply "existing", which leaves no trace. We can't say "experience of" existing, so we might say simply "being". Regardless, it is "that such that" if a shape is adopted then the self-experiencing of that shape is the case.

  Maybe this is what you are meaning by "void"?

- When this takes on a shape, then that shape experiences itself - it *is* the experiencing of itself.

  No matter what happens, it has no actual "parts" or divisions, however it can *apparently* have parts, as folds are experienced relative to one another. The experience of division and location and change.

[[OP: The awareness of being, is simply just another part of the crowd of awarenesses.]]

I'd probably phrase it as: there is no awareness *of* being but there can be awareness *of being something*.

Now, we get onto the experience of the world itself, which is a matter of that background global *felt-sense* and the bright sensory aspects and thoughts. If your bright sensory experiences (which "comes together with" space and time) fades away, then you are left with a non-spatial, non-temporal experience of *being-a-world* or *being-a-state*. If *that* fades away completely then there is no world or universe.

> OP: Awareness as a thing is simply comprised of many parts.

Or a superposition of patterns? I would shy aware from saying "parts" for the earlier reasons, because awareness isn't "comprised of" anything if it's what those things are formed from.

Patterns don't necessarily need division and their superposition just leads to a more complex form, rather than a proliferation of parts. So we retain the experiencing without saying awareness is "comprised of" parts that sum to the experience.

Reply to “Comparing oneirosophy to other tradition is a big mistake.”

TL;DR: Oneirosophy is "before" everything else and all other content is subordinate to it. Comparisons may be drawn between certain conceptualisations and other traditions, but none of those *is* oneirosophy. Oneirosophy is *the dreaming itself* and the study of this.

Reply to “Any tips, tricks or texts on remote viewing?”

You should *so* have let it happen. Well, depending on the target of course.

> Q: I'd prefer to avoid the future...

It doesn't necessarily enter determinism as such, right? Only the future as it will be if you don't re-intend it. What you will experience if you don't make changes.

Something to contemplate: In the old science fiction stories of teleportation, there was the concern that since the original copy of you would be destroyed, and it would be a duplicate that would appear at the destination, you had killed yourself.

In *this* form of teleportation, it is *the world* that is destroyed and created anew, as you are effectively translating your viewpoint to another position on the 'Infinite Grid'.

It's (exactly) as if one line of thought starts to fade and another becomes brighter, more immersive, and if you let it fully snap into place, you're there. But this involves the previous scene *including your bodily presence* fading out and being replaced; your body-experience is part of the environment-experience that changes.

This makes sense, since generally you are "viewporting onto" a configuration rather than being a body physically in a place, but - No, I've not let it follow through either in that way - because it wasn't at all clear that that's all that would shift, right? However the difference is probably one of entering a thought that one comes back from (OBE/LD) vs one you do not; there is a difference, of intent I guess.

It may actually be better not to have thought so much about reality. In ignorance, you just have remote viewing and *maybe* a teleport and are none the wiser. In knowledge, you have to confront the fact that by doing this you are leveraging a different concept of what "the world" even is.

I think experience is self-organising though. There aren't rules, so much as ingrained habits or patterns, which become entangled with one another.

Which is why things don't need maintained: experiences arise spontaneously in accordance with the current distribution of activated patterns. What we are doing here, is using the fact that it's possible to *intentionally* change what patterns are more active.

I think the problem isn't so much that you might break habits that you like inadvertently (although this can well happen), it's that the very recognition of the possibility shows you that these habits weren't real in the way you thought they were anyway. Your friends aren't in fact stable consistent separate people with an existence independently of yours; events and people don't even "happen" when you aren't observing them; etc.

Your "higher self", then, is just you with a widened POV; there is no-one "doing" anything; widening your POV will certainly give you easier access, the equivalent of extra dimensionality as it were, to go around-through obstacles. But that itself may be an uncomfortable reality breaker for many, who prefer to think in terms of guardian angels and designate some experience accordingly.

The short version is: to use these insights you must effectively commit to the idea that you have a "private copy" of the world.

By "you" I don't mean you specially, I mean "we" or "one". Just realised this read like a presentation speech! It's meant as general thoughts I am having.

> Q: So yes, it can be said to be self-organizing, I just can't seem to fathom how it possibly organizes.

It's not easy to describe, but I think of it a bit like how layering two patterns over each other combines into a new pattern. Nobody "made" the resulting pattern, it just naturally emerges from the patterns that have been laid down so far. So wherever you look, there's always an experience apparently ready and waiting for you, since that "space" is already occupied by a combination of all the patterns or observations you have accumulated so far (previous events and previous thoughts).

> Q: On the one hand, powers are awesome, on the other hand, I know that if I can simply instantly have everything I want then, well oddly enough nothing really changes.

Completely agree - if that's what we would do. But I think what happens is, you start realising that you never really wanted to (say) actually own anything - what you've always wanted is to have certain experiences and not others.

So, you don't *really* want to own a Tesla Roadster, you just want *some* of the experiences that go with that ("driving a Tesla" not "doing garage maintenance on a Tesla"). You don't *really* want to be rich, you just want some of the experiences that you think go with it ("not worrying about money", "doing what you want" not "handling investments, avoiding corrupt accountants").

A lot of our desires are about not needing to worry anymore, to feel safe. With this (oneirosophic) understanding of our worlds, that can go away: we can always feel safe (potentially). The most important thing is that by knowing how it works we can avoid accidentally generating experiences that we don't want, and realise that:

All experiences are *real-at-what-they-are*.

Maybe lucid dreams are a good example of this. In a lucid dream, do we just start summoning various objects and then sit back on our sofa? Do we just go to parties or play golf?

No... just like you say, we go on *adventures!*

[...]

> Q: you could practice consciously controlling what you view when you visualize the card or whatever and deciding that is what is out there in the world.

Such a good point. If you think of the *facts-of-the-world* as the being accumulation of observations so far (and in logical space their implications), then this is about right.

When you look at a location in an "undirected" way, it is *creation-by-implication* - the content of the observation is "filled in" according to whatever patterns are active in that context. If you do so in a "directed" way, which really just means that you are holding a particular pattern in mind when you do the looking, then you are deliberately selecting the content of the observation.

Since new observations that are created by implication will always arise in a form coherent with prior observations (the world always "makes sense"), and every new observation re-triggers and entangles prior observations, it's a good idea to take deliberate control of anything important - since revising it later (although possible) is more difficult.

It doesn't matter whether the "observing" is sensory (main experience) or shadow-sensory (thought), they both count as part of the definition of the world, except for the intensity of their contribution.

(Related: *All Thoughts Are Facts*.)

Reply to “I've learned how to wake up, but I'm too afraid to do it”

It doesn't mean loss of identity - **it means *recognition* of identity and context.**

It's like you've been watching a TV show all your life, confusing yourself with one of the characters - and then one day you relax, your attention opens up, and you discover you're actually a guy on a sofa in a nice apartment holding a TV remote. *And you always were that guy.*

Now, that initial opening up might be uncomfortable; it'll feel very exposing at first, but that's just like how tight muscles are uncomfortable when you first unclench them.

It's just like a lucid dream: you realise you are dreaming, and then your realise that this means the "you" that is dreaming is not the dream-body or perspective, it is the whole "space" in which the dream experience arises. The experience of awakening in a lucid dream is truly freeing and exhilarating.

For starters, you understand that your intentions have global effect, not just local body-movement effect. When you decide to go to the grocery store, it isn't that you bodily move there - rather, *the whole dream shifts towards the experiential state of "you-being-at-the-store"*. Meanwhile, it's incorrect to say that the dream "happens" at all. Nothing is "happening" while you are not experiencing it, although we infer it must have from our observations. Reality isn't this other thing that does stuff, like it has a separate intelligence operating independently of you. That's too movie-ish.

Short version: **You don't need to worry.**

[...]

Hey! Getting straight to the important stuff, I see! So I suppose we should start with a question: Why do you expect that those wishes should be true already?

This world has been around a lot longer than most of your dreams, and has become pretty stable - although you *can* create persistent dream realms and you'll find they operate very much like this one.

You can indeed have on-demand changes though; any delay is due to "plausibility", related to the form of your intention, and that's something you could work on by examining your ideas of what the world is. (Just because you accept it's a dream, doesn't mean you've dispensed with the idea that it's still a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time" of some sort.)

Meanwhile, to remove a pattern completely, you need to remove all "amplitude" from it, but it's generally easier to abandon something and switch to a replacement, just as in a lucid dream you'll tend to open a door to a new scene, rather than morph the current scene. Anyway, as to your "wishes"...

How *exactly* have you gone about wishing for things so far?

The problem with these "wishes" is that they can be outside of your daily experience - and what your life is, *is* experiences and that's the key to selecting things. You have to identify what the actual *end-state* experience is that you actually desire. Vague notions of things often aren't helpful and can be contradictory.

You also have to be careful what you wish for. For instance, your country becoming a sovereign state may necessitate NATO preventing other movements during the events of the transition phase. There is going to be a transition in time between *this-state* and the *end-state*.

It also matters how you conceive of the world. If you really think that the EU, USA, Russia are "out there" and that they "happen" unseen, then that can be problematic. Those ideas become part of your intending if you "wish" in terms of those assumptions.

All of this is why manifestation approaches tend to, in some form or other, advocate deciding on the desire and then having faith and forgetting about it, by which they really mean do not define or interfere with the apparent means by which the desire manifests.

Meanwhile, the so-called "jumping" approach will give you all the same problems if you don't have the formulations down pat; it's really just an active metaphor to allow yourself to let the world-pattern shift more drastically, it's a decision that it's "okay" if things change discontinuously.

So... make it specific in terms of an *end-state* and how it would actually be experienced. All manifestation must be about subjective experience, because that's all there is. Maybe pick one single thing and focus on that first?

Reply to “What do you think attachment is?”

I'd say, attachment is any part of the "world-pattern" that you are refusing to let move or shift into a new state. If you are attached to the experience of your body being sat down, you won't let it shift and "change shape" into the experience of being stood up.

Unwillingness, yes, a holding back. The extra problem is the related conflict: we want our desires fulfilled, but we prevent the world moving towards them. For as long as you think there is an "outside world" to be scared of, you will be reluctant to release direct control of the inter-transitional states. That's where faith and trust (sometimes said to be "in God", but really it is faith in a spontaneous process) come in.

Reply to “All the Feels (Are Yours; Act Like It!)”

Something that can be helpful: viewing bodily sensations, thoughts, feelings as *part of the world* rather than part of "you". If what you (as consciousness) are having right now is an experience of *being-a-person-in-a-world*, then your preferences (which really about to feeling-states) are just part of that world-experience. Just because that part is closer to where you've typically narrowed your attention, doesn't mean that it is more "you" than other parts of the world.

This leads us (hopefully) to identifying with the background space which *takes on the shape of* experience, rather than identifying with the experience itself. (Yes, they are the same thing, but the context is unchanging whilst the content is ever evolving.) It is much easier to detach, modify, release something when we aren't grasping onto it as part of our identity.

My garden is blossoming with purple trees, obviously.

In easy imagery, I see it as not "standing on" the particular fold of the "reality blanket" that you are intending to move. But you have to see that the fold is *within you* and therefore accessible, without it *being you* and therefore not movable.

We can easily fall into language that has come to imply the opposite of what we mean. For instance, to make ourselves understood we might talk about how "everything is internal" - in order to dispel the idea that there is an "outside". But really we mean there is *neither* internal nor external, or at least that those are artificial divisions which divide a whole into parts arbitrarily. The use of internal-external then leads to misunderstandings on what subjective idealism would mean, assumptions of solipsism and so on, all based on trying to think of one perspective through the lens of another. And so on.

There's a common thing where an idea is accepted *partially*, in such a way as to be "made safe" and less radical. One example is that Neville Goddard's instructions on revising the past are interpreted *psychologically* rather than literally, or with new-age swirlings about releasing emotional energy and so on. It's only half the message with the other half replaced by something more comforting, less philosophically disturbing.

[...]

> Q: Physicalists love your post.

"Materialists just won't believe number 4 on this list!"

Reply to “Techniques are a double-edged sword.”

I guess that if you think of a technique as a straight up pattern-activation - using what's currently prominent a bridge, like triggering one memory via another by association - then it doesn't seem so bad. It's a way to get to an experiential result without having to detach from everything in order to create it discontinuously.

While there is no technique to intending itself, getting to a result by intending the starting point of a chain of activation seems valid to me - and can be used in innovative ways.

Since everything is "us", then all technique and cause-effect is fakery. So I tend to think that any move away from a "taking on the shape" approach (no cause-effect, we shift ourselves as ourselves as a whole), by identifying with one part of ourselves and using it to try and operate on another part, tends to intensify division. By using tools, we withdraw ourselves from the target - but *being* the target is exactly how to make deeper progress.

On the other hand, representational approaches (attaching meaning-patterns to objects and then creating experiences involving the objects) can be fun and easy and does get to the heart of treating all experience as a dream environment, where anything can mean or do anything.

The problem of Second Cause in a nutshell. The confusion of association (linking of memories) with causation.

Yes, "being the target" isn't easy; even the phrase already implies a division. The only way that seem to work is to "stop generating". In other words, cease maintaining division. Even the direct approach of "becoming" requires that. Detachment and intention all over again.

A better interpretation is: there is no "way" to do this, so there's nothing for me to say.

Whatever I might say, would be a description of a technique. There are no doors or way to make it easier, because it isn't hard *or* easy. In truth, I wrote everything I had to say about it around 7 months ago and 4 months later. Anything else is really just a reformulation into different language, the creation and application of different metaphors, which might generate fresh ideas for experiential direction, but none of which change the underlying message.

> Q: I knew that. I still think there are things to say.

Yeah, I agree that it's about removing obstructions. But how are they removed? By the same non-way approach of intention. There are always things to say, because the total pattern is always changing in terms of distribution, but there's nothing that can be said about intending and "the truth" except saying that it is *not* doing and *not* this or that. There are infinite ways to not-say-it though. :-)

Cheeky on the criticising=technique! ;-) Now, I don't say anything can't be done, but by that I mean that I don't believe there is anything that cannot be experienced, so I'm really talking about "the experience of doing". Which would be Second Cause again...

>Q: Do you figure your contemplation will change at some point?

Well, the underlying thing of it I don't see changing (which amounts to a *not-this*), but everything else will definitely right? And subjectivity is a good one: there's that whole thing of realising that for there to be a

notion or experience of being subjective in one way, that's not being subjective in another way. If it is discerned at all, then there is somewhat of a division or contrast in experience.

So yeah, you're spot on that the style of contemplation will change quite dramatically, because even to look at something is to have it shift by the looking. I think that just knowing this means it's more of an "exploring possible experience adventure" rather than an "uncovering of fundamental truth" though?

I suspect a lot of us (naturally) get into this looking for some ultimate knowledge, something that can be discovered and seen and used - a "thing". Then eventually, it a cliche, but we find that it was here along along and that, so obvious, it *must* be everything and everywhere already. As you seem to have, I spent a lot of time wrestling with should about "me" and tried to manipulate it into a certain way, relative to a world, to overcome boundaries and all that.

But then, if I instead view everything as "experiences", and that the experience of being me "comes-with" a world, I realise I don't need to worry about boundaries or separation. I view it that I am having the experience (taking on the shape) of *being-a-person-in-a-world*, and that "the world" is a state that includes all of this. Spontaneous body and thought experiences arise from and are part of the world, a continuous pattern, and reveal its present state. Intention-imagination is then the act of *directly being and modifying the distribution of patterns that constitute that world*.

There's no room for "me" at all, in one sense; I don't need to worry about it.

No, the world isn't a *ground* of experience. By "world" remember that I don't mean a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time"; I mean something more like the current state or pattern of your present experience. To leave the world would be to allow those constituent patterns to fade, and others to become brighter and more dominant.

Essentially, there is no world other than the experiencing of it (of course), but it's usually to have some way of referring to the present state.

> >Q: There is no room for anything other than "me." What isn't my choice? I can't find it.

If it's all you or there's no you, it amounts to the same result. No division, no (apparent) existence.

I'm not claiming any definition is "the ground of experience". There is no "ground" except in the sense that experience is "made from" consciousness-that-is-me or whatever. I'm just suggesting that repartitioning our idea of person-and-world can be helpful.

Hmm, I was talking structure there, but yes the "fundamental" is will/being/potential and all that stuff - the attributes of a "something" that can become anything. Y'know, God. Yes, I'll sign your bible if you want.

The world is my Bible, Nefandi. I've noticed you reading it on a daily basis, which is great. Not that you have any choice of course. I'm here for all eternity, so do tell you your friends - thank you and good night! ;-)

[...]

> [3man: “In other words, cease maintaining division.”; I very much like this phrasing.
>
> Jives with my model of experience that I base off of the Hindu trinity. All of experience is creation, maintenance and destruction (actually transformation).

> I find this to be a nifty way to view things. Creation can be seen as the intending, maintenance as the confidence or knowledge of one's intention as truth, and destruction as detachment or the act of experiencing truth.]

Ah, interesting about the trinity. Particularly specifying "maintenance", which is usually hard to incorporate into a model.

I've tried to push away from those divisions too by having all possible patterns pre-existing, and varying only in their levels of contribution - their "intensity". This means that creation, maintenance and destruction are just the experience of redistribution, and intending is the act of reshaping that distribution (by activating or "recalling" a particular pattern into prominence). It makes it clear to me that everything is a *shifting of experience*; nothing is made or destroyed; it's *always* transformation and transformation is actually mundane.

But of course, it's yet another way of chopping up the same thing into different language!

I think the benefit of the approach of this subreddit is, we can feel free to use whatever "chopping-up" feels appropriate at the time. Freed from concerns about being "right", we can adopt whatever view is the most *useful* for our purpose.

Your trinity description has the definite benefit of being *static* - you can hold the concept in your mind and refer to it easily without having to "run" it mentally - whereas the shifting-transformations description is *dynamic*, so a bit slippery for everyday use maybe. (I'll be adding it to my armoury!)

Reply to “Can someone define Oneirosophy for me? Did we make up this word? Or is it a mash up of words and am I to dumb to see it?”

> [cosmicprankster420: i made up the word when I made this subreddit. it does say right on the side bar what the word means using the prefix oneiro meaning dream combined with soph meaning wisdom.]
>
> [AesirAnatman: We think you are the Lord God Almighty, dreaming you're a lowly human. Lucidity is waking up to that fact, and then using that knowledge however you see fit.]
>
> [3man: Your question's been answered but I'll go a bit deeper into it. The study of oneirosophy begins with the supposition that the world is a dream, and dives deeper into the wisdom of what that means. Is it real? Why is the dream consistent sometimes and inconsistent other times? Are we separate from the dream as a dreamer, are we the dream itself? I think we are the dreamer, and the more adept we become the more perfect our dream becomes. We're on a path to dreaming closer and closer to perfection. We'll never reach it because we're already there, but because stagnation isn't perfection (how it could it be that would suck), we are constantly in a state of imperfection heading toward perfection and that is the perfect state.]

Experiential content is relative, **only being is absolute. You are "being".** Plus the other answers.

Reply to “em:t 0096 Lucid Dreams (full album)”

It's good eh? Hmm, I guess we stress because we imagine moments we aren't in, as if they are hurtling towards us unavoidably. In fact, we could stay in one moment on "the grid" for all eternity - time is *movement*, it does not "pass by". Also, to imagine those hurtling moments is to strengthen their contribution - i.e. make it more likely that they are there, and that they are hurtling. *Duck!*

I think we all have an underlying assumption of causality. It's really hard for us to commit to the idea (or cease to resist the idea) that moments just appear, and that we don't need to work and suffer for them. We want to feel causal in terms of actions within the world, when actually the "causality" is our own patterning and any acts are pointless unless they arise from that - i.e. beyond the world or as the world.

(In the past I have spent lots of time *working hard* while forgetting to intend. What happens? I spend lots of time working hard. Then I remember to intend? The project is wrapped up in a day, or just sort of 'disappears' somehow.)

In fact, if you take care of the intention (you declare your *end-state* as already true), then whatever you find yourself doing will be along that experiential path - inevitably. You are free to enjoy your moments, because your work is "already done".

We really have to directly experiment in order to satisfy ourselves of the truth of this, though - to take it beyond philosophy and turn it into applied metaphysics / truth.

Which is as it should be, of course.

> Q: Without causality(patterns) our expierience would just be a cluster of discontinuities, which is also not desirable.

That's the key. The term "causality" is generally used to mean that *events* cause one another. That *this* experience leads to *that* experience.

In fact, all experience arise from, or rather *as*, patterns. Rather than, say, the traditional image of causality as billiard balls bouncing off one another, it's more like attention traversing a landscape.

The landscape, being one continuous shape, is inherently *coherent* (one part makes sense in the context of other parts), but we would never say that one part of the landscape *causes* another part. When the terrain shifts, it does so as a whole - the landscape moves itself as a complete pattern. It is only because our attention traverses the landscape in a narrow trajectory and in time sequence that we feel that "this part" causes "this part".

The key realisation:

- That all intention applies to the entire landscape, even though we only have one "moment" of it unfolded into 3D-immersive form at any one time.

So when you decide that you are going to the grocery store and will buy apples, that shifts the landscape to bring you the experience of physical movement, the presence of the grocery store, and the apparent availability of apples. The whole world shifts to give you the fruits (results) of your labour (intention).

It is *us* that provide continuity. It is *we* who give shape to the "infinite gloop".

> Q: NDE.. bliss... you lay there completely satisfied, nothing can make you uncomfortable.

I think it's fine to have that experience, but it's nothing special - in the sense that it's just *another* experience. If you stay in any particular configuration, then you-as-the-world have come static. How boring! A particular experience only makes sense in contrast to other experiences.

So the bliss might be lovely, but it's lovely in contrast to the fading patterns of other experiences. The experience tells you more about your other experiences (it directly reveals to you that you "take on the shape of" your experiences; the world has no depth other than this) - and then it's time to move on.

Yes, the "loudness" problem really is an issue. All impact, not subtlety. It means there's not much replay value often, because there's nothing more to discover in the music. I think it makes tunes much more disposable. Maybe the next underground scene will be all about "delicate" music!

Reply to “Is Dreamless sleep truly dreamless?”

Materialism is "inside" subjective experience, though. It can never be identified as "real" - only "consistent with experience", a useful narrative. Narratives are either useful or not, self-consistent or not; they are never *true*.

Anyway - Surely the real problem here is having a notion of time as being an actual thing, like a timeline which events are strung along? This leads to the notion of "skipping". If instead of this abstraction we just have time as being "the experience of change", then nothing is ever skipped. The scene has just shifted more dramatically than usual from one "moment" to the next.

In this case *invented narrative* might be unfulfilled as a result (although we can fill that in by asserting "brain seizure" or some other plot element), but nothing is skipped in actuality.

In the subjective view, there is no world that is "happening" beyond my experiencing. Kastrup's view still implies a "place" which unfolds in time, for instance. I can find no evidence of this in my own unfolding though. It is a narrative tool, but nothing more?

I definitely think it's a fun narrative to explore - I love the idea of "forgotten dreams" that only leave a slight trace, a trace which you might come across one day.

Like a memory pattern that has very little associative connection, just maybe a couple of threads that form a bridge between that dream and everyday life - but if you were to find the right thought to trigger it, basically the key to that realm, a whole neglected world would spring up around you!

Reply to “I'm beginning to question some things about oneirosophy.”

I'd say this being God Almighty thing is just another "as if" hat you can put on. The true sense in which you are God is that you are consciousness, and the world is solidified imagination within that.

Meaning - The world has no depth, but it's not in the sense of having no complexity or mystery, right? It's just that it is not "made from" anything; it is not a place. It's true that it comes down to "nothingness", but only in the sense that there is no solid substrate or ultimate pattern; there is still *meaning*. Experiential content remains mysterious, because God Himself does not know what the *next-moment* will contain. If he did then that would already be that *next-moment*. The complexity *and* the simplicity are unbounded.

Oneirosophy (or nondualism/idealism) doesn't remove the mystery, it just means it is clearer what's going on, which is something along the lines of:

- We tend to assume that we are people in a world, in fact we are conscious perspectives having a *being-a-person-in-a-world* experience.
- We tend to assume intentions act locally (body movement, deliberate thoughts), in fact they act globally (the whole world shifts).
- We tend to assume the observed facts of the world are definite, in fact their relative contributions to experience can be adjusted.

So it's really about a removal of misconceptions. Following that, the experience you choose to have is your own. You can live the life you want in the version of the world you want. There really is no fixed content-based truth at all; there is only the fundamental truth that it's all arising in awareness.

The only problem might be, there's sort of nothing to say beyond that. If there's no "how it works" and all experience is relative, it means you can't even really argue about things anymore...

> [AesirAnatman: When I say 'You are the Lord God Almighty', I mean you are the being who willfully adopts perspectives, and those perspectives become your reality. Those perspectives include things like physicalism, qi-energism, christianity, and solipsism.
>
> I mean: all knowledge, belief, expectation, fear, certainty, uncertainty, experience, hope, dreams, objects, etc. are conceptualizations within your mind, structured and manifested out of deep, mostly unconscious, intentional conceptual frameworks (perspectives). I mean you can, but don't have to, make those abstract conceptional frameworks conscious and transform them, and you can, but don't have to, make their concrete experiential manifestations conscious and also transform them.]

Being more direct, we could say that as consciousness we have no inherent formatting, and *any* structuring is a patterned fiction. **Neither solipsism nor co-creation** (for instance) **are right; they are both just potential formatting.**

[...]

[[**7kek7**: *“Oneirosophy is not "the secret”, its not a magic genie lamp that will grant you all of your material desires”*; **I disagree, when I want it to be, it has literally been a genie lamp.** Changing one's perspective on experience and letting go of materialism is great. **But the real power is in then shaping that experience to one's desires.**]]

[[A: Oneirosophy provides a model through which one might understand how or why the Law of Attraction/"The Secret" works. At least, that's how I see it.]]

Reply to “Why solipsism and egotism are not required in oneirosophy”

To me, oneirosophy surely means that **all experiences are possible, but none are fundamental.** Physicalism (being a body in a world) is one coat you can wear. Solipsism (as defined as: "you" are the only personal mind) is another. The underlying truth is when you take off all coats - *and this cannot be conceived of*.

When we fight to claim Being The Almighty, we are claiming a conceptual pattern as fundamental. Ironically, in the pursuit of infinite power, there is a *potential* danger of binding to one of the most severe limitations there is.

Reply to “Dream is interesting”

Yes, it's interesting to think that we might have given ourselves this role and forgot about it. Part of oneirosophy is recognising that you are "the dream" rather than the particular character you seem to be. If you've been practicing Buddhism and meditation, then I'm sure you've been thinking along these lines before: that what you truly are is a "consciousness" which is "taking on the shape" of a being-a-person-in-a-world experience.

> Q: i am the dream.. it also seems to mean that we are one with the world and the world is within us. if i understand you correctly.

Yes. Without getting in depth, I'd say that what we actually are is an unbounded "aware space" in which all possible experiential patterns are "dissolved". The moment you are experiencing now is just the combination of the various patterns that are active, the brightest of the patterns. You can think of this as similar to how the sun (the current moment) dominates the daytime sky, but actually all the stars are still there (all the other possible moments).

This means that there is no world "out there". For instance, the room next door isn't "over there", it is dissolved into the background, here. Our ongoing experience is like a *strand of thought - it just happens to be a very bright, 3D-immersive stand of thought that seems to fill up our aware space.

I've posted a long-winded version about this stuff before: *The Patterning of Experience* and *A Line of Thought*, maybe worth a look in a bored moment. The "imagination room" metaphor linked in the first post can be quite useful I think.

> Q: if the dreamer here could travel the same world we are currently residing? or the dreamer always travel in the dream realm outside the world we are residing?

I say there is no restriction. There is no difference between selecting an experience "somewhere else" or "here in this world" or even "another time in this world". It is all here, now, available. The trick is to ensure you are starting a "thought" which is seeded from this world, rather than a random creation.

Reply to “Everyday Inception”

Consider this as strands of thought, perhaps? From that perspective:

- What you might call your experience of *being-a-person-in-this-world* is a very bright, persistent 3D-immersive strand of thought which fills up your perceptual space. Directing your attention to that thought, you directly feel your so-called body and so on.
- However, most people have got into the habit of starting a *new* strand of thought, a thought which is "about" their body.

  This may be because they rarely have their attention expanded into the main strand of thought; instead they are focused in one of the spatial gaps, making them vulnerable to getting lost in passing thoughts, and rendering their awareness of the main thought like a "peripheral vision" experience.

All strands of thought occur within the same aware space, kinda "parallel-simultaneous" with each other. There are no "levels" like inception, but there are relative "brightnesses" at any one time. Being fully present would mean that the brightness of the primary strand would be intense, and there would be no narrowing attentional profile deforming it.

Another dream-like thing that people get is deja-vu! ;-)

I have an extra thing to say, which I'll write up properly later maybe, about how we often make the mistake of trying to move our bodies by gripping onto and moving the body-sensations. However, this just generates tension (we are intending the experience of "gripping"); we should actually intend-imagine the target posture, or a fictional image which implies the movement for us, and allow the body-sensations to shift towards that goal effortlessly.

A *feeling-movement* seems quite a good term to me. Intention can be the movement (really: a thought of an end-state which experience then moves towards) or it can be an indirect assertion (an imaged object causes the movement), but I guess both of them are basically subtle asserts of fact. There is never any movement really; an intention repatterns or defines a sequence of moments, which your attentional focus then encounters.

If you've read the Missy Vineyard book, you might find the exercises in *The Michael Chekhov Handbook* worth a look. They are exercises for actors, but essentially (unwittingly) they leverage the realisation that your experience is imaginary. Because they are written for performance use, they are described in an accessible way and quite a few people seem to find them enjoyable.

> Q: The tension you speak of. Perhaps one could think of it as the common art of 'walking' applied to all 'movement'? Most of us seem to walk effortlessly, in that we do not appear to consciously consider each individual step or twist of the ankle. So we do not really think of 'walking' as a series of literal steps that we have to take. The 'walking' is just what it is feels like to be aware of the imagined target coming into actual being here and now. Which is what Douglas Harding points toward with his experiment of spinning the world, or driving the world.

Yes, this is a similar angle to Missy Vineyard and Michael Chekhov (Alexander Technique variant and acting imagery, respectively). It's a changing of context leading to a change in how you intend. Douglas Harding is

pointing out that same thing as "being the space in which experience arises", although he never quite says it straight I think.

I think most people, even though they walk effortlessly in the sense of not individually directing their legs, do somewhat "re-intend" their body position continually, which is equivalent to sending a "stay still!" order at the same time you are directing a movement. When you release that pattern, it's like gliding.

It's about a level of trust. Trust that the spontaneous movement that arises is the appropriate one, even though it feels that it is an uncontrolled response. In truth, so long as attention is fully open (actually: no attentional control) then the total available information is being contributed to your response, and it will be maximally appropriate. Ironically, any effort to constrain attention or movement to control experience, will lead to a "less safe" route. However, it feels *very* exposing to pursue this at first - although it leads to a sense of ongoing pleasure once things settle out and more of the "background" shines through.

[...]

My father has it... I have it... my sister has it... **you have that power, too.**

Reply to “My Experiences So Far”

> Q: There are lots of lessons to learn here.

But *is* there anything to learn really, beyond the one main lesson? Beyond realising that the *content* of experience is transitory and relatively true, and that only the *nature* of it as consciousness does not change and is fundamentally true - surely everything else you apparently discover is really just "more dream"?

> AesirAnatman: Even that lesson is more dream. You're dreaming a dream of discovering the transitory content of experience and the nature of consciousness. And you're also dreaming anything else you learn or don't learn. Knowing your true nature and not knowing your true nature are both dreams you can dream.

Agreed. **The lesson is really a command: *"cease and be!"***

Reply to “Playing with Attributions & Points of View (Yer uh Wizard, Harry!)”

[[**Utthana** (OP): I was talking in the comments of another thread about playing with how you relate to perceptions. Here’s a little more about that.

Look around you for a while. Really get a good sense of where you are and how you feel right now. Take a few minutes to do that.

… … …

Good? Alright. Now, try creating a division between two distinct types of experience you’re having:** “direct perceptions” and “attributions”.** Notice the difference between the visual keyboard you're perceiving and your concept of “what a keyboard is”. To help you get a grasp of the difference between the perception and the attribution, try changing your attribution. Think about your keyboard as the instrument that it is. Then think about it for the block of atoms/matter that it is. Then think about it as the visual stimulation of 2d colors in your eyes that it is. Then think about it as the geometrical object in space that it is. Then think about it as the extension of yourself that it is. Note these different “ways of thinking about” the perception, and how they differ from the perception itself. Notice how much easier is it to play with these "ways of thinking about" than it is to play with the direct perception itself.

Try doing this with more complex, nuanced things. Look at your neighbor not as, for example, “Jeff the guy”, but as the hairless and upright homo Sapien, as the geometric object in space, as the sack of meat and flesh, as the conscious being with experiences and perceptions, as the child that grew up into an adult, as the background character in your solipsistic world, etc.

Now, take note that one of these was your “default”, while the others required an active consideration on your part. If you’d just stumbled out of bed and saw your keyboard, or saw your neighbor, you’d be “subconsciously” using one of these default attributions.** In fact, nearly everything you interact with is conceptualized in merely one way of many possible ways, and your current defaults can be changed if you’d like to change them.** If “Jeff the guy” is annoying to you, “Jeff the kid who grew up into a confused and sad man” might be less annoying, or if your keyboard seems crude and mechanical, thinking of it as a physical object of color and shape may make it less abrasive.

Your “default” is not very different from the defaults of most people. Collectively, we share a lot of default ways of conceptualizing things. These are “cultures”. Cultures are collected, habitual, often subconscious ways of conceptualizing our perceptions. If you feel your default way of conceptualizing things is shitty or non-ideal, then you can break away from your cultural habits. Personally, I think my (our?) culture has a lot of shitty habits both minor and major. For example, minorly, I think our cultural attitude toward food is pretty lame, and that we could be handling food in a much better way. Majorly, I think each of us has a tremendous potential for power and influence over our own state of being, but our culture conceptualizes lots and lots of “external” things as having power of us, and by assuming they have that power, we grant them that power.

This is kind of like being Harry Potter, and the invitations to Hogwarts are arriving in the mail, but instead of bolting up the mailbox, Uncle Dursley has taught the whole family that envelopes will burn you if you touch them, and so nobody ever touches an envelope, and if they did, they probably would genuinely think they were being burned.

Alternatively, you can try to be "culturally open". In other words, question your habits and tendencies and *play with* your habits and tendencies. See if you can't change your defaults. See if you can't start to love something you used to hate, or see if you can't find depth to appreciate in something you'd only understood superficially. You can also do these things in the opposite way (e.g. hate something you once loved) and while it's less fun and less encouraging, knowing that you can do that and being able to do that is important if you prioritize flexibility.

Of all the things one can shift one's default attributions toward/about, the one I've found to be the most interesting is the way one relates to other living things. You're currently experiencing reality/yourself as a being within a world. This is probably not a very unusual mode of experience. We can imagine experiencing merely a volitional being, and we can imagine experiencing merely a non-volitional world, but between those extremes there seems to be a "bigger infinity" of potential experiences that involve both a volitional entity and a non-volitional world. Taking the POV of a being or entity appears to be a common perspective (at least from where I stand).

While "you" are *not* a human, which is to say your capacity is not constricted to only being a human, you can (and, I think, should) dwell on the fact that you *are currently experiencing a human point of view (POV).* You're currently "humaning". And your spectrum of experience is that of the particular human you're experiencing "yourself as". So, while I'm =/= Utthana, the current perspective I'm taking is Utthana's perspective (although I do sometimes take others). And just so, other living things are unique in that they exist within our perspective *as* other perspectives themselves. For example, TGeorge exists within my POV, but he exists *as a POV himself* within my POV.

This means that there's "a way it's like to be" TGeorge. You can meaningfully say, "This is *what it's like to be* a cat," whereas you can't say, "this is what it's like to be a chair". We can imagine ourselves as experiencing ourselves from the POV of a cat or from the POV of TGeorge, in a way that we can't imagine ourselves as experiencing ourselves from the POV of a chair (as conventionally understood – we can imagine something that looks like a chair which could have a POV). Being mindful of this, to me, is super useful and enjoyable. I like recognizing other POV's within my POV because my default is often to objectify people and the really inflate my own POV. I don't tend to see other beings as full and as nuanced as myself, but Utthana the human and TGeorge the human are both equal POV's that I could take. So I like taking this perspectives (sometimes, and not always), because it allows me to:

1) Empathize. All POV's are POV's that I could theoretically take. I'm the capacity to take perspectives, not a specific point of view myself. "That could be me," is applicable to everyone I encounter. I like to play with my default conceptualization of other beings in such a way that I'm inclined to have empathy for them. I currently am interested in playing a role of someone who is relatively non-aggressive, non-competitive, helpful, and kind. To further my interest in playing that particular game, I make things easier for myself by changing the way I look at difficult people (some of the time).

2) Be aware of the glaring subjectivity of my own POV. By regularly acknowledging and appreciating other potential perspectives, you come to appreciate your own perspective in light of others. You become aware of all the possible perspectives you could take. I especially like dwelling on plants, because plants have a potential perspective and POV, but it's radically different from that of animals and helps to demonstrate just how alien our perspectives can potentially be (which in turn highlights the potential weirdness and alienness of our current, default POV).

3) Change my attributions more easily. Seeing my default perspective as just one among many helps make it seem less "front and center", less dominant, less immovable. For example, I currently look out my window and see trees, grass, etc. They look kind of dark and I conceptualize them in a slightly negative way. They don't seem as positive as grass and trees in brighter lighting. Understanding that my default perspective is just one of many possible perspectives, I can decide to see the dim lighting as beautiful and cinematic, I can decide to see the grass and trees as miraculous shapes that grew from the ground, I can decide to see them as distinct entities with experiences and perspectives, or I can even decide to (and this is a step further, altering perception instead of attribution) see something entirely else outside of my window, like the Eiffel Tower. Asserting a new attribution or perception may, at first, feel like it's "only happening in your mind" or "imaginary". Further weakening your sense of your default POV as privileged (as well as further contemplating subjective idealism in general) will make "imaginary" seem a lot less imaginary and "only happening in your mind" seem like an arbitrary description.

I recommend you experiment with different conceptual attributions for your perceptions. Don't think that your perceptions can only be conceptualized in one way. **You don't have to learn how to do magic and directly change the "physical" world around you in order to radically change your experience in ways that make you happier and help you do things you'd like to do.** You have tons and tons and tons of default, subconscious attributions to your perceptions and every single one of them can be played with. This whole thing is malleable. And even the "anchor" of your attributions and perceptions, your particular "POV as a being", is merely one potential POV and you can play with that as well. Start small, work your way up, and try not to be discouraged by any tendencies to dismiss things as "imaginary" or "all in your head".]]

A good read. Couple of quick ones for now:

> OP: And just so, other living things are unique in that they exist within our perspective as other perspectives themselves. For example, TGeorge exists within my POV, but he exists as a POV himself within my POV.

Because this phrasing implies a nesting problem, it's probably better to say that all possible POVs are "moments" that are simultaneously available, and you can "take on the shape of" any one of them. The TG that is apparently within your POV is made from "sensations and perceptions and meaning"; it is not actually a POV. A POV is an experience, it isn't something that can be contained within anything else.

> OP: "this is what it's like to be a chair".

I don't see why this wouldn't be possible. People on ketamine report experiences of just this sort (becoming a certain object), as do those following various shamanic practices. It can't be imagined when not being

experienced, of course - i.e. while you are still experiencing "human-ing" with the baseline sensory-channel formatting that this involves - but then again you can't experience being joyful and simultaneously imagine being depressed either.

> >OP: This [becoming chairs and tables] is a subtle and tricky point, though, and you're right to question it. I wasn't sure how to convey it in such a way that made it sufficiently clear.

I agree it's a tricky one to discuss, because the discussion itself is of course "formatted" as a shadow-sensory experience, so it gets very abstract very quickly - but I think it can be quite a fruitful path to explore. There's no one way to make it clear, I'd say.

> > OP: I don't think it's possible to experience yourself *as an inanimate object*.

What is special about "animation"? You can become the void space you are "looking out from" right now, and that is definitely not animated as such. You can become the gaps between sensations. You can also become your hair.

> >OP: [They] experience themselves as being something very chair-like, but it's a distinct thing from what we think of as a conventional chair.

That would be the exact point though, right? If you-as-consciousness *become* a chair - if you "take on the shape of" the experience of *being-a-chair* - then it would not correspond to what we, while human-ing, think of as "a chair". I think the subtle underlying important insight here is that the "aliveness" or "intelligence" or "experiencing" that we have *belongs to consciousness*, and not to the shape of the experience. "Senses" are an abstraction, you never experience them. "Being human" is a dead pattern, as dead as a chair. Lend your attention now to the room around you, allowing yourself to "feel" into it in all directions. You experience this room by *becoming* it, filtered or organised by certain patterns. Even if you remove visual imagery, auditory imagery, textural imagery from this experience, you still have an experience. Are you maybe thinking about "human-ing" as being your current baseline experience in some fundamental way, when really it is consciousness?

I think even the notion of a "POV" might be problematic here. Because I don't actually have a human POV as much (as you've just pointed out with your examples), what I actually experience is *being-a-world* but formatted in a certain way. And doesn't "perspective" have the same problem? What *exactly* does it mean to "have a perspective"? It's just another way of saying we're taking on the shape of a particular experience, surely?

Let's perhaps skip to the bit we probably would need to bash out between us: *knowing*. (We can always back-pedal later.) This is not fully formed, I'm just trying to feel out how we could approach this verbally:

I suggest:

- To "know" something, you simply have to be it. Knowing *is* being, and vice versa.

This is not the same as having a conceptualisation of being something, of "being aware you *are* that something", since that is actually a thought *about* what you are (and is always wrong). The difference between *knowing* and *knowing-that*.

- To "know that" you are something, is to become the *thought-about* the knowing.

I suggest that we often confusing *becoming the thought about something* ("knowing that") with *becoming the something*.

> >OP: I think you may be onto something that 1 is possible, while I think 2 is not possible.

Yes. We might draw comparison with our own experience, living as a human person. Let's proceed from our everyday experience:

- We are always experiencing "being" a person. (This is not strictly true in fact, but for this brief moment let's go with it and we'll return to this later.)
- *From time to time* we experience *knowing-that* we are a human.
- The *knowing-that* takes the form of a thought, and that thought arises as basically a "shadow-sensory experience". In other words, formatted as human senses.

This leads us to:

- The manner in which a human *knows-that* it is a human, is in the form of a *human-patterned* experience.
- The manner in which a chair would *know-that* it is a chair, would have to be in the form of a *chair-patterned* experience.

So - I definitely think that one can *be* a chair. In fact, I think that our ongoing experience is a case of *becoming* lots of different things, so this is not a stretch really. It's actually harder to argue that we experiencing being a human as such, rather than just occasionally *thinking-that* we are a human.

I am *not* definite that one can *know-that* one is a chair, while *being* a chair. And perhaps that actually takes us somwhere interesting:

- In what sense is it true that I can simultaneously *be* a human while also *knowing-that* I am a human, anyway? Surely I am *either* being a human *or* being the thought-about being a human?

And if this is the case, then doesn't that lift the restriction on *knowing-that* you are a chair? Because it reminds us that *knowing* and *knowing-that* are on the same level. It is *consciousness* that takes on the shape of both experiences. Consciousness is surely free to take on the shape of "being a chair" and then "knowing that it is a chair", without restriction?

> >OP: [Knowing, not knowing, know-that simultaneously:] it's more likely possible than not possible. As a general rule, imposing restrictions on consciousness is false.

Agreed.

The way I conceive of this is through the idea of "lines of thought". To recap briefly: if we go back to the idea of what we truly are being an "unbounded open awareness", then our current experience if *being a person in this room* is really just a very bright, 3D-immersive, spatial thought which is filling up that openness. But it is a thought nevertheless.

Then, there is no reason why, just as we might visualise a sphere floating in this perceptual space, we cannot at the same time hold a "parallel-simultaneous" experience in that same openness. We can look at a mountain range and simultaneously have a thought *about* mountains. In fact, we can be walking along a street in San Francisco while parallel-simultaneously paragliding in France. It's a matter of the relative intensity of the experiential patterns, rather than actually "being in a place".

In a very real sense, we are having all possible experiences parallel-simultaneously right now - it's just that one or more of those "present-potential moments" are brighter and therefore more dominant than the others. (Usual metaphor: the sun in the daytime sky obscures the stars that are always there.)

So, in this discussion we're increasingly moving towards, again, consciousness as primary and any experiences - including reflections *upon* experience (which are also experiences) - being always available and current. Our apparent "human-ing" is therefore not at all restrictive inherently - except that for as long as it remains "bright" we will not be chairs nor be able to think from the position of being a chair. And if we become chairs completely we will not be able to think about being so in a human way.

The question then perhaps becomes more about the ability to *associatively link* from one experience to another, rather than about the ability to have an experience. I can be a chair and then be TG, but whilst TG I might have no associative path to recall the memory of being the chair.

> OP: Time stops being of much use here.

Indeed, really we mean the experience of change or relative change (although that has problems too). I treat time, like space, as "arising with" a particular strand of experiencing. I use "parallel-simulateous" to try and convey that things don't necessarily share the same experiential space, although they all appear within "open awareness".

> OP: And learning to play with relative brightnesses is what I'm particularly interested in.

For me, that's exactly what all this is about. The apparent manipulation of reality is all about what I would call "triggering patterns into brightness". When you move from this room to the room next door, you aren't going anywhere. Rather, the 3D-immersive image of one room - the *thought of* one room - is shape-shifting into the image of the other.

> OP: Are you REALLY the chair or TG? Or are you just experiencing yourself as if you were the chair or TG?

Yes, that's the question. That's why I keep going back to this "taking on the shape of an experience" wording. You are not inherently anything in particular, you are "that which takes on the shape of" things. For convenience, it's handy to use the phrase "I am TG" while that is the experience, but all experiences operate on an "as if" basis.

This is where the notion of *imagining-that* comes in. Right now you are *imagining-that* you are a person in a world. You are also *imagining-that* a whole set of *facts-of-the-world* are true, and the brightening of those patterns as a superposition leads to the selection of the moment you are experiencing now (as a metaphorical description anyway).

>OP: I found this to be a really productive and interesting convo.

Me also. It's always clarifying, especially if we're coming at it from slightly different starting points. I guess it's inevitable that eventually we'll all converge on at least a *recognition* of the common underlying aspects to each of our approaches.

As to the other subs, my project is basically split three ways: developing metaphysical models (here), collecting spontaneous shifts ("glitches"), exploring practical reformatting ("jumping"). The strands have to be kept a little bit separate though, because mixing the platforms mangles your experiences (a point which follows naturally from our discussion).

Reply to “It seems like y'all are en route to mastering the siddhis, but...”

> [OP: Hi there. I'm going out on a limb here and assuming that most of you (the prominent posters, at least) are familiar with the tenets of Buddhism--it seems that "oneirosophy" is (inherently) a melding of Eastern/Western philosophies. I have no doubt that there are some of you in this subreddit who are currently mastering/have mastered the siddhis (psychic powers that arise as a result of lucidity).
>
> My honest concern is, is not oneirosophy itself ultimately just another distraction, like everything else? I've spent many hours reading through a bunch of posts and they're all quite stimulating, intellectually and spiritually, etc. However, there is a LOT of ego here. Like, a lot. A lot of pride and condescension, as well... even if it's not intentional. While oneirosophy resonates with me (admittedly!), sometimes I can see why the Buddha intimated that it's more difficult for gods (as opposed to humans) to achieve release.]

Well, I'm inclined to say: *why not both?* ;-)

I know what you're getting at, but provided you recognise experiences for what they are (peak and mundane it's all the same), then you are fully free to enjoy them, since you realise you *aren't* them fundamentally. That even includes having fun by being a bit of a dick in an argument now and again.

Perhaps it's not what you mean, but surely pursuits of power are only "distractions" if you think you are separate from the world and that one part will overcome the other? In exactly the same way as "seeking" is a distraction. So long as you don't mix up the narrative with some sort of "development" - you have understood that although you may change, you never progress - it's okay I reckon.

An interesting question to ask ourselves: once you've realised the nature of things - and know that there's nothing to it, that it's boring - what then? You just gonna sit about for all eternity?

Everything stays the same.

That's why so many enlightened folk of tradition still drink, smoke, are rude and impatient, all that (apparently). By default, you are still having a *being-a-person-in-a-world* experience. Just because the world turns out to be dreamlike in the sense of having nothing behind it, doesn't suddenly make you a super-lovely guy - unless you arbitrarily decide to be so.

And that's what you *do* have, more options (or rather the rediscovery of the options you always had) - i.e. the recognition of the possibility of changing your "private view" as you please.

People tend to have an idea of what "enlightenment" is, and that it'll equate to some automatic Gandiesque outlook. But it is, at base, simply the recognition of the nature of experience: that it is consciousness "taking on the shape of" content, and the world is not in fact a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time".

So, your behaviour might change because it comes with the direct recognition that "everything is consciousness" and everything is an aspect of yourself - but "yourself" isn't the *personal* self, and the nature of reality is in truth *amoral*, so it doesn't pan out quite like folk might assume.

If you suddenly realised that what you really were was "a big open space in which experiences appeared", then all your preconceived notions about what is important get recontextualised. It's this shift in context, and its implications, that others tend not to get.

Reply to “Anyone finding progress?”

"Just deciding" is an assertion that something is fact. More specifically, it is like increasing the contribution to your experience of a pre-existing fact or pattern. (It is pre-existing, because it is thinkable; all patterns exist eternally.)

For all the reasons you identify, it is much easier for people to use misdirection for this, and use a mental or physical act and attach the meaning to it. In other words, we think a thought or perform a ritual which we have decided *means-that* a situation will occur, or that a fact is now true. (And we choose not to examine too closely that the thought or act itself came from nowhere.)

Elsewhere, I tried to encapsulate it with these snappy bullet points:

- *Act + Intention + Detachment = Shift*
- Assigning a meaning to an act is what gives it causal power.
- Assigning a meaning to any experience can give it causal power.

The problem you might be having is that this is all literally unthinkable conceptually, and you cannot experience yourself "doing" intention - you can only experience instances of it, of *becoming* it.

One possible illustration: if you were a shape-shifter, how would you describe the process of shape-shifting? You would just "become" the new shape; it's all you, so there's no one part causing the other part. Continuing with this: how would you work out you were a shape-shifter? The only way would be... to shift your shape. There would be no evidence of you being a shape-shifter between shiftings. Intention and deciding and all that, have similar problems. You are perhaps seeking to experience something that is "the thing 'before' experiencing".

Reply to “Wu-Wei, doing nothing”

> OP: It means doing away with the compulsion to "better ones situation" or to be mired in ignorance of one's perfect position always.

I'd also add that it is a much more practical thing. It's that thing of your body "moving by itself", effortlessly. It's the flowing detachment which means your body and mind respond appropriately to the situation. This often gets overlooked by authors, because if you've never heard of the experience and never had it, you would never know that this is what is being indicated.

Just as with (say) the parables in the Bible, where, because they don't know what is being pointed at, they interpret it in all sorts of mundane ways relating to making choices and moral views (not to mention an "entity god" who is separate and does things independently).

So, one might do away with the compulsion to better ones situation, but that's in the sense of ceasing trying to directly manipulate it with action, rather than with intention and letting the action flow. Anything you do is "correct" in the sense of it arising from the current state in response to circumstances, but only if you truly allow action to rise spontaneously, rather than holding on to parts of your current state.

Wu-Wei, then, is perhaps better described as "not interfering" and "opening to spontaneity" and "effortless action" in a direct experiential sense. However, as with all these things, it *does* then get used as a metaphor in other parts of life.

Perhaps the core of this is: people confuse *intention* with *experiencing bodily action*.

In fact, an intention can be attached to *any* act or experience (and an act is really an experience: the experience of an action), whether it is "regularly" logically related to it or not, and results will follow correspondingly. Without understanding the rule that "experiences are local, intentions are global", it's inevitably that things like wu-wei *and indeed everyday motion and experience*, will be misinterpreted.

Any ongoing intention which countermands our spontaneous movements - of body, mind, attention or world - which arise in the moment. Something like that?

However, practically speaking, we would of course occasionally "redirect" things by intention. But it should be in the manner of *course correction*, rather than slowing things down because we don't trust our spontaneous responses and so holding onto every moment. In general: you should be sitting back and enjoying the unfolding experience, rather than constantly hitting the brakes.

A further thought: also, *pushing ahead* or "forcing" is also interference, and probably the most common type. You are walking along the street to catch your bus, and you force the walking to go faster than it is spontaneously occurring. Lots of examples of this, large and small, all stemming from a lack of trust that what is arising naturally is appropriate. (So you get to the bus stop, and it's delayed for 10 minutes. If you'd kept your relaxed pace, you would have arrived at the perfect time - and so on.)

[This is very meandering...]

I'm sat on a chair. I'm thinking about how crappy work has been. I've been pretty depressed about it. Wait! I intend:

- *"A great business opportunity that's ideal for me."*

I potter about. Feel hungry. Fridge is empty of healthy food. Maybe I'll go to the grocery store to buy apples. I pause. My body gets up, and does this. I find myself enjoying the sights and sounds of the city as I walk a couple of blocks along. I find myself interacting wittily with the shopkeeper, but before I make a purchase, I bump into an old friend I had been thinking about earlier, and we pop into the bar round the corner for a pint of cider ("liquid apples, almost the same!"). We have a fun time. During our conversation, he mentions that his ex-girlfriend is setting up her own design business. Knowing I'm into those things, but my work has dried up, he give me her number. We meet two days later for a coffee, our business ideas are totally aligned: why don't we set this up as a partnership?

= one intention + letting experience arise.

You can live without intending, but if you never intend, then experience will just continue along its present path. I will remain depressed, depressing things will continue to happen.

Intending = re-patterning, with that patterning subsequently arising in experience.

The main lesson is, though: there's no "fundamentally naturally good state", because that would be the notion of destiny. I don't agree with the notion of destiny, or of a path that is independently correct. If you don't like the current state you are in - perhaps because it has become very "splashy" and incoherent, you can use intention-imagination to bring it under control more efficiently. Things will resolve themselves eventually, but deliberate intending lets you "skip to the end".

For instance, fixing the heart or abdomen as your centre provides a stable, reliable point as everything else shifts and evolves. (Although ideally you are spending daily time letting all of that left over movement unravel anyway, through a releasing period.) I'd call those areas the "global summary": by attending to *but not focusing on* - perhaps "including" is a better word - you get a situational awareness of an overall type. It doesn't guide you, it is just is the most efficient way to be directly aware of all available information. Which allows you to decide intelligently whether to amend it or not.

Short version - If you don't like your situation, intend the alternative. Having done so, then trust that the world has been re-patterned "4-dimensionally", and let things unfold. If you keep intending (micro-managing) then you don't get the benefit of the "autocomplete" nature of patterning - instead, you will only get exactly the step-by-steps you ask for, that you can intellectually design, and you won't benefit from any "magical" coincidences or discontinuities, etc.

> OP: But couldn't the state of allowing your intentions could be the fundamentally naturally good state?

Okay, this is a wording issue I suppose. I use "state" to refer to the current configuration of the world, all the activated patterns in their relative intensities. If you don't interfere, then all the experiences which arise spontaneously will do so in accordance with that configuration. If you intend, you shift the state, and subsequence will arise in alignment with *that* configuration.

So in this sense, one state is as good as another in the sense that there is no configuration that is "*the* configuration". Just like there is no "best" pattern of ripples in a pool of water.

Maybe if we use "approach to living" rather than state to mean what you are saying, then we can say that non-interference would be the ideal approach - with occasional course-corrections (amendments of state/configuration) if so desired.

> OP: My heart is sending out good feelings when I align to my highest intention. What is my highest intention? To be free.

Can we change this to, rather than "sending out good feelings", some thing like "*is* a good feeling" when you align to your highest intention? And then I'd suggest: what's happening is that when you cease to oppose the spontaneous arising of experiences, you feel a clarity and maybe even something like "love"?

Note, you can have this feeling regardless of whether the current state is traditionally a pleasant one or not. The feeling comes from not being conflicted or fragmented, not from a situation being good. People feel most at peace shortly before their horrific violent car-crash deaths...

That's why I say that there is no such thing as a fundamentally good state, but there might be a good approach. Would that description fit in with what you're getting at?

[...]

Try this experiment:

Lie down on the floor and let go completely. Of your body, mind, but most importantly *your attention*. "Play dead" and allow your attention to roam where it wants. Habitually, we try to use attention to manipulate our experience and "do things" but this actually obstructs change. So having let go, "just decide" - i.e. intend without doing anything - that your body is going to get up. Do nothing, and let your body move by itself when it wants.

Note: **By "do nothing" you must not *actively* do nothing,** because what you will tend to do in that case is *re-assert your current position*. In other words, you will intend *being-where-you-are* are as the interpretation of "do nothing". And as a result you will suppress any movement. Really I mean, "do not interfere with any movements that arise".

> Q: I'm sure I could do it but just a bit hesitant to try. Why might this be the case?

You can *definitely* do it; it's not different to what you're doing anyway, you are just ceasing to intend the opposing motion. Stopping "staying still" all the time by constantly asserting your current position.

It's a bit frightening because you are letting go of what you *perceive* to be direct control (even though such control actually works against your intentions unfolding). It amounts to "surrendering to god" and trusting that spontaneous movements "from nowhere" are the right ones, even though you cannot intellectually access any *reason* for them.

Particularly in Western societies, there is an underlying assumption that our raw spontaneous aspect is evil and untrustworthy and needs to be suppressed. You perhaps have unexplored notions of how bodies and minds work, of there being an eternal battle between reason and magic, impulses and order, good and evil, and so on.

Really, it is fear of *The Unknown*. But you have to get used to this at some point, because *all* of experience is "unknown" until it appears within your perception.

Short version - Try it and see. Once you decide to truly surrender and give up, and things settle out, it'll likely be one of the best experiences of your life.

Oh, I had an extra thought too: when you release your attention, this obviously means you are no longer avoiding any body-space areas which might contain "stuck thoughts and incomplete movements", as I call them.

In other words, things may move and shift and that includes uncomfortable feelings that have been left "orphaned". If such things arise, just let them become prominent, peak, and they will "complete themselves" and fade. Trust this. Sometimes people clamp back down again when these things appear - if you remain in open attention, it'll pass, and will be like a wave in the ocean, rather than in a glass. The relief and calm once these are cleared is very pleasant. Note: as is the theme here, you don't need to *do* anything about them, they'll resolve themselves.

Reply to “Wu Wei, pt. 2”

> [OP: This idea just came out my noggin. The continued allowance of freedom to all thoughts may just allow the truest of thoughts to be created. We spend a lot of time trying to dictate our thoughts in one direction - nothing wrong with intending where you're going - but what if we're missing out on certain avenues because we ban certain thoughts. Because get this, we're afraid of what those thoughts will lead to. What if we just allowed them and then surprise, it turns out the lion was a small cat waiting to be cuddled. It's worth a shot, in my opinion.]

Define "truest", I guess. Do you mean, that the thoughts that arise will be ones where all information is taken into account - so, the "truest" reflection of the current state of the world in its entirety?

> > Q: If I am the absolute how come I do **not know that I am**? What robbed me of this information that should be fundamental?

Interesting accidental wording! In fact, "that I am" is the only thing that we *do* know for certain. And that's quite a good starting point.

Even now, you don't necessarily "know" you are The Absolute, you simply "are" it. Intellectually, you can only *infer* that you are the absolute, perhaps by noticing that everything changes in terms of content but you (as a feeling of being) always remain. Experientially, it's similar: you find that your direct experience does not correspond to the idea of separation, and perhaps you have a particular event-experience in which all the usual content seems to drop away.

In all cases, you are *The-Absolute-taking-on-the-shape-of-The-Relative* or in other words, you are always what you are *and* having an experience. The situation where there is no shape you have taken on, "pure Absolute", is a hypothetical one. However, there is always that sense of "being"...

We maybe need to ponder what we mean when we use the word "knowledge"?

My usual metaphor: the blanket of material whose only property is *awareness*. The blanket has folds in it: the blanket experiences itself as one fold relative to another fold, in all directions. In what sense can the blanket "know" that it is everything?

- ***Conceptually*** - It can create a fold which represents the fact that it is the whole blanket and all folds. But that knowledge will always be a fold, it won't actually be the truth in and of itself.
- ***Directly*** - It always "knows" it is the blanket simply be being it, without reflection. When we touch a table, the "hardness" is the direct experience. But do we "know" that the table is hard before we have reflected upon it?

In other words, you never *forgot* that you were The Absolute, it's more a case of you never intellectually pondering it. You have always *known* that you "exist" though and that existing *is* direct knowledge of being The Absolute, just not of its implications.

Another thought experiment: how did you come to "know" that you are a body, in a general sense? In actual experience, you are always *3man-sitting* or *3man-standing* or *3man-walking*. There is no *generalised* sense in which you are a body, in actual experience, surely?

But I'd say direct experience of knowing you are it all - "being" - is special because it never changes and is always there, in a way that the body isn't quite. It's sort of everywhere, and is the *only* fact that is always available at all times and places. It has no content, so it needs no context.

Maybe the distinction we need to make is between: the knowing and the meaning?

Reply to “True "timeless" nature of dreams?”

> [OP: First time posting to this sub, and I do wonder if this is the right place for it. Please let me know if I've got this right or not. I've just awoken from what I think was a rather involved dream, and as luck would have it, the narrative evaporated from memory as I woke. However, what I was left with is perhaps more interesting. Along with a general "feeling" as to what the dream was about, I have a mental "impression" (I guess) of a (I guess) 4 dimensional structure that I feel or know represents the dream in its entirety.
>
> The structure seems brown and convoluted, somewhat spherical but with complex external and internal geometry. Curves, planes, lines, crossing and not crossing in all different dimensions. It also has a rather organic and "composed" feel to it. And to me right now, it stands as synonymous with the dream that I just had. So, I wonder. In certain cases (or maybe in all cases), could dreaming be kind of 4 dimensional, timeless experience? The entirety of the dream is related to us - or created by us - all at once as some sort of timeless, geometric construct, and our physical, everyday brains are then tasked with interpreting and translating that timeless narrative into a sequential narrative?
>
> In any case, this was my first experience at understanding how a timeless structure can also be rewound as a temporal one, yet still have the same identity. They are both objects of "becoming", but one occurs with events one after the other and the other is an "occuring" all at once. The latter feels more complete to me though since you can hold everything, the entire structure, all at once.]

So, the "global summary" of the dream, a representation of (but also *actually being*) its entirety - encapsulated in a *felt-sense* of its overallness?

My suggestion (via *The Patterning of Experience* and related) would then be that your current world is **also** a *felt-sense* that you are interpreting by unfolding aspects of it into sensory experience - arising as a 3D-immersive strand of thought in your "perceptual space".

I say - No recursion. Just forget brains. And interpretation, as such.

A moment's pause, a relaxation of attention, and it's obvious - *right now* - that what you truly are is basically an "open aware space", and all sensory experience arises within that. "Sensory experience" includes thoughts, which are basically "shadow-sensory"; they are just not so bright, stable and 3D-immersive.

I might then suggest that *there is no 'outside' to this space*, and that all possible experiential patterns pre-exist and are dissolved within it, varying only in their levels of contribution.

All you need to do is, while looking at this screen, direct your attention to the "place you are looking out from", and note what you find there. (The alternative is to take a leap of faith and "just decide" to become the background space to your current experience.)

[...]

Tonight with my popcorn I am enjoying a glass of wine from expert winemakers, Ribera del Duero.

Ribera del Dueros vineyards are situated to the north and south of the river Duero which runs from east to west though its middle. The region is located about 100 miles northwest of Madrid and it is influenced mostly by a Continental climate, with warm summers and long cold winters. Moreover, the high altitude of the

vineyards is a significant quality factor for winemaking in this region: most vineyards are located at 750-800 metres above sea level.

Although not traditionally associated with the oneirosophy scene, Ribera del Duero is in fact the ideal accompaniment for philosophical idealist conversations, due to its inherent ability to blur the boundaries between subjective and objective when consumed in sufficient quantities. Perfect for drinking alone, or with other aspects of your larger self...

> OP: Metaphysics AND wine suggestions? It just keeps getting better. I've been meaning to shift wine regions from Italy to Spain.

I like to think they are inseparable. Well, that's undivided consciousness for you, I suppose.

Seriously, do. You have to choose a little more carefully, perhaps, but you tend to get a much lighter, "liquid" wine with a precise flavour on top, rather than a thicker taste with everything mixed in. That's a poor description, but hopefully you get the idea.

"Personally, I never navigate the Infinite Grid without it..."

Reply to “The idea of imaginal metabolism.”

I hadn't thought of using "digestion" as a metaphor before - really interesting.

If everyday life (and specifically the body) is basically "imagination solidified", then any imaginative act performed with intention can potentially have an effect. Although we habitually view our sensory experience and our thoughts as existing in different realms, in fact they differ only in intensity, and share the same space - which means that the connection is a matter of degree rather than possibilit-ee.

So, when in other comments I say that "all patterns are always present and active to some extent", it's in the same sense as that. It's not that the "embodied imagination" is a special level in terms of it being a primary structure, say. Rather, flipping it around, it's that this particular set of patterns are currently very bright, and therefore dominating our experience. *Any* collection of patterns could become the "embodied imagination" if they were intensified appropriately.

So, this gives us a couple of obvious ways to soften things up a bit, right?

- We can do it indirectly, via an imagination object imbued with particular meaning. For instance, vividly feel-imagine a sprinkler located in your stomach area which spins round, whose water has the property of dissolving the solidity of the world, and leave it running. *Or --*
- We can do it directly, by 3D-imagining/asserting over our current experience (i.e. in the same space as our present perception), an open empty unstructured space with the property of "dreamlike flexibility", for a prolonged period perhaps, such that this default of transparent malleability becomes more prominent.

So they're the same approach fundamentally, but the implications are different.

I've not got the phrasing down for this, but let's have a go...

In both cases, you are creating something from nowhere - the sprinkler, or the "space of flexibility" - and assigning a meaning to that act, a result that it implies. It's just that the second one *seems* more abstract because it doesn't have an obvious "shape", and the second one also involves the creation of something which has the property of the result. However, that property is you *specifying* the change, it is not you *making* the change.

In both cases, the result is indirect. It is the changing of the fact that is implied, that brings about the result. The imagery itself cannot cause anything - one piece of transparent imagery cannot bounce of another piece of transparent imagery.

I suggest that a fact itself is a dimensionless part of an extended pattern and has no sensory aspect itself, so if you are at all aware that you are changing a fact, then you are always "creating something which *implies* the change of fact" (an act), not directly updating the fact.

When you go to a bar you've never been to before and open the door, you are not aware of updating the fact of the barroom; but the very first intentional step you took towards going there, *implied* the fact of its existence, and every other intentional act you did shifted the world and *implied* a particular sort of barroom - right up until you actually observed it. At the point of observation, it becomes "fixed" in the scene that an

experienced scene is much "brighter" and becomes a high-contributing pattern when it comes to subsequent experiences.

And in reverse order -

> Q: I think it's also possible to make one's style of experiencing into something where experiences do not become overly fixed no matter how bright they might seem.

Yes indeed. You might view it as there being a contributing pattern/fact which corresponds to the statement: "The world is a stable place and the implications of a sensory experience constitutes a set of facts which persists once the sensory experience end".

These more abstract patterns are of exactly the same nature as any other pattern: they always exist but their contribution to ongoing experience can be increased or attenuated.

Which leads to some interesting questions about how far one really wants to go with messing with accumulated structures - there's flexibility available, sure, but there's *decoherence* if you push it too far.

> Q: Why not directly? So you're saying facts are only and ever implied? Are facts always tacit? I think this might be important, but really I have trouble feeling what you're trying to get at here.

EDIT: Warning, this is not well described. I'll probably try this again after I come up with a better way to put it into words.

Let me try and grab a hold of this. There's a couple of approaches I can think of to describe it (bear with me since I'm formulating this as I go).

So, let's begin by taking an obvious fact:

- "Everyone always loves me." (heheh, why not!)

Now, try and summon that into sensory experience. What you'll likely come up with is an audio-visual-texture-emotion sensory *aspect* of that pattern which includes a *felt-sense* of it. But remember, that particular pattern is one without a temporal restriction - it is immediately "all time everywhere forever". You can't actually experience it from a 3D-immersive single moment viewpoint, much less in a contracted image. You can't grab it completely and hold it in your hand (so to speak). You hold *part* of the extended pattern in the senses. And that extended pattern is part of the undivided pattern of all-patterns.

So what I'm getting at here is, while any possible intention is of course is a shift of the entire pattern (or "all possibilities"), we obviously do not experience that because we are only ever aware of a slice of it. We operate in the blind.

When I create my sprinkler, it is simply by hook onto a larger pattern which I cannot fit inside my current perspective. But since the sprinkler is connected to that, it becomes my proxy, and my manipulation or specification of that, becomes/is my manipulation or specification of the more abstract fact.

When I do this with my "softening of the space", I am doing the same thing, although it's more subtle. I am imagining, implicitly, a space and that the space is softer. I am not actually directly making my current space softer, the space I am imagining is just the partial aspect of the intention. You can see this in practice because

when you do this, the form that gets triggered in experience "happens by itself" *towards* the imagination, like you have pulled on a piece of material.

You notice the same thing when you use imagination to move your body. You can imagine a wind blowing your body forward, and your body will respond as if that were so. Or you can imagine your body in the forward position, and your body will shift state towards that position. We might call it *"intentional leading"* or something like that.

When you try to heal yourself, how do you do it? You quickly realise that grasping onto the sensations and trying to change them doesn't work. Instead, you must "be the space" around and through the area, and then either use a metaphor to change it, or imagine the replacement sensation. But I'd suggest those are both the same thing: ***creating a desired sensation is still a metaphor for that target state*** *and is not the target state itself, because: time and the inability to fully specify, you can only imply.*

Practically speaking, it's not that important, and I'm obviously struggling to convey it. But for as long as there are any patterns active, there will be a notion of change, and for as long as that is true, there will be a "leading" effect, I suggest.

> Q: Here I don't agree with your choice of the word "directly" in the context of the above-quoted paragraph.

The sense I'm using "directly" in that paragraph is in the experiential sense - that within the current sensory field (as you phrase it) you are experiencing performing a creative act relative to your desired outcome which you might *naively interpret* as being an interaction between *just* the sensory objects.

So, taking the "naive view" as being one where we assume that what we experience in the sensory field is what is happening, then:

- In the sprinkler example, even in the naive view it's obvious that you are taking an indirect route - in the sense that you experience yourself creating an intermediate step. You've created an object with properties, such that it will bring about the change.
- In the updating-space example, though, in the naive view we might think that you are actually interacting with the space that you have been experiencing and modifying it. Hence the potential interpretation of updating it "directly".

In fact, the two approaches are identical, it's just that the "sensory aspect" - the visible part of the iceberg, if you will - of one corresponds more closely to what the experience of being completely in the target state will be like. The "naive view" person is not doing what they think they are doing in the "actual view".

In the "actual view":

- *All* experiences and changes are direct - because there is no other way for anything to be. All that exists is "The Absolute taking on the shape of The Relative". So any experience of change *actually is* that, being and changing. You can't get more direct than actually being something.

A sensory act is like shifting the tip of the iceberg, or pulling a rope in the dark. The sensory experience is just your *sensory handle* onto the larger pattern you are invoking.

Some sensory handles happen to be of a form that is a more literal representation of the intended end-state, but that does not change their level of directness. The handle is always indirect (in the sense that it does not provide a naive experience of the change) but also totally direct (in the sense that it is a direct interaction with the *facts-of-the-world*).

We can also think of these handles as "icons". Let's use an everyday example, where there's a folder on my computer desktop and I want to remove it.

- The "folder" looks like a folder. It has all sorts of folder-concept associations for me. My tendency will be to think of it in terms of an actual folder. In truth though, there is no genuine "folderness" underlying *either* the icon *or* real-life sensory folders, *other* than those associations. And therefore I can create my own association.

However, in our computer example:

- I can right-click on the little picture of a folder, and select "Delete" from the popup menu. This is like the sprinkler example, where the act is more of a more abstracted form. There is nothing about the letters D, E, L, E, T, E, that correspond to the everyday sensory experience of removal. This is revealing of the principle: "the meaning you give something is what supplies its causal power".
- Alternatively, I can drag the the folder to the trash. This is like the "updating space" example. The sensory aspect of the act matches my usual notions of how the act of deletion works: a folder getting put in a bin. But really I'm just being fooled. Just as in the last example, there is no literal correspondence between the sensory experience and the *form of the update*. In fact, the actual update *has* no form and is literally unthinkable; I can only think in terms of icons/handles. This reveals to us that our accumulated historical meanings are no more direct or real than the ones we arbitrarily assign.

The conclusion is along the lines that all sensory experiences are "handles/icons" for the larger pattern, undivided from it, involving direct interactions, but not complete experiences, because they are not completely unfolded. Our habitual perspective doesn't have enough "dimensions" to experience the whole thing unpacked simultaneously, into 3D-immersive space.

So hopefully this ties your comment and my comment together? Specifically:

- All updates are *direct* in the sense that there is no such thing as *not* being direct, because all there is, is Absolute-Relative. It is always directly experienced, but not in unpacked form. Facts and patterns are "dimensionless" in this sense. (*Felt-sense*, global summary to the rescue.)
- All updates are *indirect* in the sense that our sensory experience of the act is not an actually an experience of the overall pattern changing.

As you indicate, we are left with inseparability, full responsibility, and unbounded potential or capacity - whilst also having a situation in which "all creation is finished" and always available.

Yes, I'd forgotten about Hoffman's icons (I was just looking for a more immediate example and, um, I was looking at a computer screen). But yes indeed. Where I differ a little is that I was more explicitly pointing to the icon as being "attached" or rather seamlessly part of the larger pattern. To "tug" on the desktop icon is to literally pull upon the extended pattern it is attached to.

And that's why I say things are unthinkable, in the sense that the computer screen cannot display the entirety of the of the computer, because not all of the computer is made from "colours" and a part cannot display the whole of which it is a part. In clearer language: we can indeed think about anything, by manipulating the sensory iceberg tips, but we cannot think of the entirety, because thinking *is* partial experiencing. Experiencing the whole would be... experiencing the whole.

As far as the term "Absolute" goes, yeah, it's the hypothetical state that we might call "unshaped" experience, the raw state - not my favourite term for it, but we need something, and I tend to try different ones out. I think a word *is* required for this, because it's only in contrast to this concept that we can fully point to the nature of relative experience. Otherwise it's like describing waves without having the concept of water. Of course, experience *has* no medium as such, but its difficult to discuss its arbitrariness without some concept that "all patterns" exists somehow, even if totally neutralised.

On "dimensions" - just a metaphor to better imagine selection (or relative intensity) and apparent perspectives. Specifically, that you can't simultaneously imagine a 3D-experience and imagine a 4D-experience. This connects to the thinking-with-iceberg-tips earlier, really. As you say, representation - *which is really partial sensory experiencing of extended patterns* - cannot be complete, at least in terms of being *unfolded* into a spatial context.

Meanwhile, elsewhere there's been discussion of those events where people experience reaching a catastrophic end - and then it didn't happen, but it seems the world has shifted somewhat. Interested to hear your own interpretation on that, jumping off from my response below:

Factual Updates and Collateral Shifts

If the world is a continuous and coherent pattern, a blanket of material with folds as facts, then you can't adjust one fact without tugging a little on the rest of the material, impacting the other folds. Although these "collateral shifts" would make sense in terms of the fundamental nature - the blanket - they wouldn't follow the logic of the world's apparent content - the folds. For instance, your car tumbles off the side of the road but - *flash!* - suddenly it didn't happen after all. Changing that fact inevitably results in a collateral shift of the world as a whole. But it takes the form of, say, an extra tin of fruit in your kitchen cupboard, a news reporter's hair being parted at the other way, and an acquaintance you've not seen in 10 years now never existed. Those changes are *causally* linked to, but not *logically* linked to, the event.

Quite possibly you would never encounter these updated facts. However, the change in your *felt-sense* of things - that "global summary" sensation that you have - might mean that the world sort of "tastes" different subsequently. You intuitively know that you are no longer in the same place. There's a different "flavour" to your life after the accident somehow.

Riffing on this a bit...

> > Q: So if there was just flash, and suddenly the accident didn't happen, could you recognize such an experience without the requirement of differently parted hair on a TV announcer? I think yes, you could. So it's not a hard requirement to have differently parted hair.

It's not a requirement - rather, it's an example of a possible side-effect arising because a change of one fact tends to lead to non-logical shifts in other facts, as they are of course part of the same overall pattern. So you

survive the crash, get home, and notice (hey!) an extra tin of peaches. The *cause* is a shift of state, but in terms of everyday logic it *seems* nonsensical to the experiencer.

Of course, this is a case where our experiencer produced an intentional shift of state (albeit unwittingly in terms of outcome, it was probably: "I want to live!"). If they'd just let themselves die, their experience would continue but probably in a more interesting way. So moving a hair doesn't change anything. The movement of the hair is already part of the current state, which is static and eternal. Only *intention* changes state. If the movement of the hair was not already patterned - it wasn't going to arise - then the intention to have it move represents a state change and will have (very minor) collateral effects, otherwise it will not.

What we might call spontaneous or "passing" experiences (in the manner of "passing thoughts") do not correspond to intentional changes of state; they are deterministic unfoldings from the current state. Only *intentional redirection* changes the state.

> Q: It's not like shifting can be studied objectively.

Well ***nothing* can be studied objectively.** The point I was making was, no particular collateral change is *required* but any change *can* happen by the logic of continuous, coherent patterned states.

> Q: I don't think we can talk of the state as something beyond intent, on its own.

We're not, though. The state *is* your current total intent so far. When we intend something, that's not something additional on top, it *is* the shifting of this state. So if we think of our current state as the set of all-patterns, each pattern at a different level of contribution, so there's a relative distribution of intensities:

- That state *is* our total intent. It is static and it completely defines our experience going forward.
- What we call "intending" is really "changing the relative distribution of intensities" such that our state corresponds to our intention.
- Because there is no separation between "intending" and "shifting of state" - it's like a blanket of material folding itself into a different shape, under its own volition: shape-shifter metaphor - then "intention" *is* "the state".

Our current intention *is* our present "shape" - just like our current physical position *is* the relative arrangement of our body parts. We change bodily position by rearranging the body, which we call "moving"; we change intention by changing state, which we call "intending".

Yes indeed, the body example was an everyday perspective comparison. Heh, perhaps we should introduce a special character (‡) that corresponds to "but of course, the whole known universe was involved in this".

- "So I‡ was walking down the street‡, and I went into the shop‡, and bought an apple‡ which I ate‡."

[...]

> [[Nefandi: *"It's not that the "embodied imagination" is a special level in terms of it being a primary structure, say. Rather, flipping it around, it's that this particular set of patterns are currently very bright, and therefore dominating our experience. Any collection of patterns could become the "embodied imagination" if they were intensified appropriately."*; I agree with you completely. However, in this I think we're slightly different from the book author because I think he feels this embodied imagination

is completely special and unique and "on its own level" so to speak. It's not a philosophical book, so it's hard for me to put my finger on the author's metaphysics, but he does sound somewhat like us because he is saying that phenomena we think are physical are only quasi-physical. In other words, he's saying also that physicality is ultimately just a very impressive illusion, exactly like in a dream. However, he privileges embodied imagination and he even believes he's able to contact alien intelligence through the use of specially guided embodied imagination. So "alien" here doesn't necessarily mean "from other planets" but it only means different. So for example, if you felt yourself embodied as a bear with the mind and experience of a bear, then that would be you making a contact with the alien intelligence, as he would put it. And then this has some kind of purpose. Anyway, the way he explains things sounds very strange to me and it's not how I would explain things. However, he kept making references to the alchemical tradition and I found it interesting.

I'll try to quote a piece of it:

> [The basic consistency of all substance was called prima materia, primal matter. Since alchemists considered matter as existing in a state of con- tinuous creation, primal matter consisted of sparks of live creative forces around which visible matter coagulated. This is similar to the quasi-physical substance of creative imagination, as for instance a dream. An embodied image is in a permanent state of being created. When creation stops, the dream is over. Through extreme slow motion the alchemist participated in this ongoing creative process of primal matter, which began to pervade him, exteriorizing its inner sparks to the alchemist by way of the inversion process discussed previously, so that he could know its hidden self and partake of its intelligence.
>
> The primal matter of metals was called "alive silver," argentum vivum, quicksilver, mercury. This alive silver had to be purified, cleansed of all its ill aspects, eventually producing a golden tincture which could heal all substance: turn lead (which they considered a sick form of alive silver) into gold (its most precious condition), a sick body into a supremely healthy one. This was done by the art of the fire. Alchemists would melt, in the way of ice, the crusted outer coagulation of metallic bodies, making them flow alive like quicksilver, in order to obtain the creative sparks of primal matter, the substantive intelligence around which the metal had embodied. Unveiling bodies unto their naked intelligence was necessarily a slow process, as is all embodiment work. And as the alchemist gathered sparks, the creative potency of primal matter increased. The result was to be an ultimate medicine of such creative intelligence that it could heal all bodies, ranging from lead, an afflicted metallic body, to the diseased human body itself. Many alchemists were medical doctors. They would make this medicine from poison. The word they used was pharmacon, which means both poison and remedy, from which we derive our "pharmacy." Only from what is afflicted and its affliction could a medicine be made. This extraction of medicine from affliction they called the process of refinement. The ultimate medicine was named tinctura, the coloring agent. The tincture was of such refinement that it was almost a pure disembodied spirit, pure abstraction, like

> mathematical structures; yet almost is the operative word. While science after them went all the way through to mathematical abstraction, alchemists always worked with particular embodied sub- stances, waiting in slow motion for them to reveal their intelligence. This highly refined embodiment, called subtle body, is a pure manifestation of primal matter. Subtle bodies are embodiments existing between physicality and abstraction, in a realm of quasi-physicality, which we have called embodied imagination. Subtle bodies belong to a primal world between body and mind – less physical than matter, more embodied than mind – and their very existence annihilates the mind/body conundrum by adding a third, an in-between: primal matter. This in-between primal matter is both embodied intelligence and physical body, partaking of both inspired metaphor and physical anatomy. It was called soul-as-medium, anima media natura, soul stretched painfully between eternal abstraction and decaying flesh.]]]

That is a very mangled piece of writing! To modern ears, that is. It seems to be rooted in the older traditions, almost like a historical study, but then linking that to the modern concept of imagination. That alone makes it quite interesting.

Have you ever encountered Jerry Epstein and his use of imagery for healing? I read one of his books a long time ago (it might have been the *Waking Dream Therapy* one, I was doing the lucid dreaming thing at the time) but your post reminded me of him - and he seems to have expanded things a little. The collection of imagery exercises on his website are very "dream logic" and pretty close to what we've been talking about as a modern take on this approach.

> >Q: So if we take this literally, you can basically talk to the metals and convince them to change, because you'd assume they're not just dead substances, but are living beings.

Well... extended patterns. You could certainly have the world behave *as if* they were alive and had properties that could be described as intelligent, I suppose. However, as with everything else, it would be *your* intelligence, creating the maps, albeit by implication. Reading that sort of material can be great for triggering fresh ideas for causal imagery, ones that would never occur otherwise, you're leading me to think. I'm off to make a cup of coffee and talk to a stainless steel spoon about empathy...

> > Q: I might think, oh, I see, so now I really understand it, whereas when before I thought I understood it, I've only understood it partway in reality.

I completely agree on this. I've come to think that it's another aspect of the "after the dream... *more dream*" thing. It's in the nature of content that it is always apparently expanding; the discoveries keep coming, so the context keeps changing, so the understanding keeps evolving.

Which is another way of making it obvious that the truth you can think, can comprehend, is not the truth (because the actual truth must be unchanging). The fundamental truth is something that can only be *perceived* - known directly, now - and is not something that can be thought about.

Yes, I really mean that "the fact of being and being everywhere" is always available and can be known. As I've just said in a comment to /u/3man, you never experience purely being The Absolute; you are always "The Absolute taking on the shape of The Relative".

You would have to have absolutely all patterns at zero contribution for you to just "be". The blanket of material with no folds. Which is not possible, I would say, in the sense that if it ever happened, that would be it, or rather *only* "it", so to speak.

> Q: Why would this state be called "being" or "just being?" It seems arbitrary.

Yeah, it is arbitrary. There's no word for it. "Only awareness", perhaps. "Absence of activation", maybe. It's the only state, or non-state, which is *truly meaningless*. It would be "before" everything.

Meanwhile: I will reply to your other, longer comment later today. Want to read it properly non-mobile and give it due consideration.

[...]

> A: Ive noticed that if I believe I am trying to enact a change, then I will experience merely trying to make the change. The change itself doesnt necissarily manifest. Ill just be manifesting a struggle.

Yes, you have to generate the experience of *literally* updating the world - or doing something that you have decided *means that* you are doing so.

Reply to “No-self and other minds?”

> OP: What do you guys make of the problem of no-self or other minds? I see that there are more nuanced approaches to this topic than I mentioned above, and I would appreciate any insight you all can share. Thoughts?

One approach is:

- Instead of thinking of yourself as a person, think of yourself as an "open aware space".
- Instead of thinking of the world as a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time", think of it as a toy-box of all possible patterns, dissolved into the background of that space.

Right now you are experiencing a particular combination of patterns. A particular combination of patterns = a "world". In other words, you have taken on the shape of *being-this-world-from-the-perspective-of-this-person*.

And the same is true of everyone else.

We-as-consciousness share the same world in the sense of all accessing the same broad set of patterns. However, we are not doing this in the sense of sharing the same time or space, because time and space are part of the experience, not part of the larger context.

You can conceptualise this as each of us having a turn at being a world one after the other, or as existing at the same time but separate, or as one consciousness doing both parallel-simultanously. All of those are wrong, but it gives a way to imagine it. And you tend to find that the way you imagine it, becomes reflected in your experience - so it is "true enough".

-> Subjective idealism but not solipsism.

[Q1: “Right now you are experiencing a particular combination of patterns.”; To restate this in an interesting manner, a particular combination of patterns is creating the "you experience" within the whole]

No. He says sternly! ;-)

Patterns are not creating anything. Patterns don't "happen". The combination of patterns *is* the experience. And it's not just the "you experience", it's the whole thing always. It is better described as the *being-a-world-from-the-perspective-of-a-person* experience. You always experience the whole, it's just that, as the intensity of the sun in conceals the stars the daytime sky, some aspects are "brighter" than others.

So if I was going to be super-picky I'd revise my wording this way:

- Right now you are an "awareness" which has taken on the shape of an experience. This experience can be described metaphorically as a pattern which corresponds of the sum of all possible patterns, each of which is contributing at a different level of relative intensity.

I guess the important thing is the idea that *we* are the only things that ever "happen", and that "happening" corresponds to shifting our state = the relative contributions of patterns. Our ongoing experience is *not* such a shifting though; it is a revealing of the current state. A state fully defines the entirety of the world over all time.

What, people aren't following my every word? Then I have no sympathy whatsoever! They should get with the programme here! ;-)

This is a problem, though, with reddit and online discussion in general: how do you build up body of knowledge and refer to it? Without any accumulation of terms and imagery it's - well, not quite like having a memory reset every time there's a new post, but it probably *is* like having a reset every month or two. And if nothing else, it gets boring providing context every time, and later it gets hard to distinguish what is the default view, and what's novel with your own view.

For instance, one of the first things we have to get to grips with is that the world is not a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time" beyond our sensory experiencing of an aspect of it. Perceiving this changes the context of everything, and without that foundation in place, discussions about subjective idealism are basically "structurally wrong". So, given that, do you start from the ground up every time?

Although having said that, I do try to make things progress fairly logically, albeit in abbreviated form. If something doesn't make sense but is interesting, people can ask. If it's not interesting, they can ignore.

I personally think an eclectic, mood-based approach probably works okay - because every comment isn't just a response to a post with a pre-made view, it's also an *exploration* of your own view, from an imposed perspective, leading to a spontaneous reshaping in real time. Sometimes this means we veer off the tracks a bit in our writing - our thinking might become a bit opaque to others, since it temporarily becomes that to ourselves - but this breaks through into improved clarity for everyone later.

Today's custom-concept-laden, insurmountable mountain of a selfish response is really the foundation for tomorrow's transparent, easily-shared, transformative insight.

You raised a really good point though: over time, through our participation on this sub and others, we're building up a set of different perspectives that are quite powerful, but it's distributed across a few posts here, a few comments here, intertwined with discussions, and it's like we're keeping them alive by partially reposting them in responses. When we stop typing, it'll all disappear. (Apart from the sense in which it's always been there.)

> [Nefandi: Yea, it's true. Except it will not easily disappear from my heart, and probably not yours either. Of course inside all-potential everything is also available. But personally I don't want to see the ideas that I like get turned into a religion. Ugly things tend to happen when things become religions.]

Agreed. What I want is for things to be *useful*. There is nothing to believe in. I think when "teachings" turn into "stagnant beliefs", that's when the troubling side of religion appears: it becomes all about the organisation, rather than power for the members. (The Quakers had it about right I think)

One possibility from a while back was to evolve the wiki from its current form (the "key posts" section is very recent, actually, it wasn't *even* that before) and expand it into something which amounted to a more thorough write-up. Particularly since many of the "goodies" are lost among the numerous discussions in the comments sections, which aren't always directly connected to the posts they appear under. This, in effect, means there's no real place to go to find the full picture from any of the authors.

We [moderating authors] probably diverge a bit on the details (e.g. my whole "patterning" thing is bit of a separate branch, I suppose, so I've tried not to go overboard on that in this sub) but I do think it would be

nice, at some point, to have a more comprehensive overview of the subreddit's output, and even make a plus out of the contrasting aspects (which are really more about preferred metaphors of course). So, good idea, thanks for the prompt.

> Q2: you'll very very likely find out how Nefandi and TriumphantGeorge were wrong too

Yes, and I think that's an important thing: subjective idealism is, in a way, about "never having to say you're right". Because the content of experience, which includes ideas, is never correct or fundamental; it's shape is completely open for shifting. Which points us back to that whole thing of the only truth being *that* we are experiencing, not *what* we are experiencing.

If we've accomplished anything here, I think it's that we have reached ways of talking about things which are some of the most flexible available: they avoid saying anything is fundamental, while still offering a way of conceiving of things and so making changes, rather than just saying "not this, not that" or that you'll have to wait for "grace" to give you an experience of openness. We're saying: here are some ideas, and if you use them, you can have experiences which will reveal to you that things are not what you assumed, rather than just "hoping" that one day something will happen for you.

I think that's pretty good going for a little subreddit that's only being around for a year - probably because we happened to bring together in interesting mix of participants who have slightly different angles not the same thing, revealing each other's assumptions and producing a purer version of the total. Well done us! (Or should I say: well done me's!)

Yes, certainty is needed to make changes, but it's the certainty of change and of ability more than anything. It's a bit of meta-conviction! I like the description of in-sourced volition :-)

I think the "shopping around" period is natural - we go around picking up ideas, get obsessed with them a little while until we burn through them, and continue, and eventually we get them all in perspective and work out our own take on it all, informed by our life experiences. To some extent, it's the story of gradually giving up being "right", and instead being "true".

I guess I'd say that, being "true" means "being right for you" (which can change, obviously). Whereas we can go through periods of trying to be right for others, when all we can really be is helpful or useful, free with our insights.

Something that I notice heavily is that people want *you* to convince *them* that they can do something, or that something about their own experience is true. And you have to say really: look, only you can experiment with your own experience, only you can find out whether you can do something or not. Thinking about it, talking about it, won't do anything. It's like drawing pictures of the beach to in an attempt to see if the weather is warm at the coast, and refusing to actually go there until you've felt some heat from the crayons.

> Q2: Thinking about it and talking about it can be helpful, but not in the way some people imagine.

Right, so to clarify a little: having a discussion about something *does* intensify within people the corresponding worldview, and they will have a little bit of the corresponding experiences as a result. *But*, if they never take the time to do that for themselves, then they haven't gained a whole lot. They can get addicted

to thinking, talking about things because that's the only way they get a taste of the experience. They still want it to - as you say - be a "knowledge download". But it's always up to *you* to trigger the concepts within yourself; they don't persist otherwise, and you'll come complaining (meaning: the person will) that "it's not working". And the answer is: "because you aren't becoming".

A conversation doesn't necessarily trigger the worldview *you* are talking about, but it can at least trigger a variation of that, in the context of their own patterning. One might hope that this would be sufficient to pique curiosity and get people experiment for themselves; but it isn't very often the case. (Perhaps because most people don't really, deep down, *want* to "cheat" their accumulated patterning, even if it would transform their lives from misery.)

This isn't muffins, this is *reformatting yourself*. And once you know, although you might wish you didn't know, the fact that you know means that you will never choose to un-know, because that would be to deceive yourself, um, knowingly. Pretty much nobody wants to be the guy who likes his steak in *The Matrix*.

So, on the "reply" thing, that's interesting. Say I'm in a conflict situation. I know (that word again), that I could just "delete" the situation if I wanted. However, that tells me nothing about my courage to meet the situation on its own terms, and triumph. If all I ever do is delete uncomfortable situations, then I am not truly exploring my experience and all that it can be. Also - later - being certain that I am "secretly safe", I might conclude that life is *all about such experiences* anyway, and without them I might as well just "skip to the end" because I won't be having fun - or at least, not learning new things.

And that points to something: some people become concerned that by doing this stuff, life becomes a different sort of churn. But actually, the mystery never goes away, and in fact becomes more obvious due to its clarity: you never experience something prior to experiencing it; it's always a surprise, in the details, even if they are laid out before you, due to your intentions.

Well, it really is *mind surgery*, you're right!

Agreed somewhat on the wanting to return to oblivion re: the syndrome syndromes, although might that not be due to the lack of understanding? Depersonalisation is, I'd say, another form of localisation, just shifted spatially somewhat (in terms of the experience). You've gained an insight, but without context you are powerless to use it.

So really what we're talking about, in that latter part, is *freedom* - the lack of a *need* to do any particular thing, and therefore the ability to *choose* to do anything. And mystery, really, is a contributor to freedom, and to adventure.

And ironically, the more that is "othered", the freer you become: intend what matters, let the details autocomplete!

That's all part of the fun, though! And of course there's no certainty that micromanagement makes you any safer; "manual" operation means you can't take into account the larger context, which you get for free when you let existing patterning fill it out for you. It's a matter of taste, but I think occasional course correction probably makes for a better life overall. Either way, it's still better than "normal" life, which is blind in action and understanding.

So it's a matter of perspective (adopted, literally). If you step outside the frame completely, you've got what amounts to an "eternal static pattern of perfection" - but basically no experience. With too narrow a frame, you're left with a sort of blindness with things thrashing at you from nowhere, a completely dynamic experience with no stable platform.

Once you've calmed yourself down though, played with this for a while, then things line up a bit and the (apparent) chaos subsides, and you can trust more, especially since your intuition tends to be clearer, so you do in effect see beyond the immediate 3D-frame.

Perspectives: I really did mean "literally" on the perspective thing - as in, viewing something from *here*... rather than *here*. Seeing the whole pattern laid out, versus being "inside the maze" and not being able to see around the next corner, only having faith that your intentions are always fulfilled. That kind of thing.

Tending the garden: Well, that sounded very Biblical Parable! And that's not necessarily a bad thing at all.

The Biblical reference wasn't judgemental there; I think that book was originally a perfectly decent attempt to codify a particular description of reality (namely: the apparent internal shapes the apparent external), which has become somewhat corrupted by poor and culturally-unaware interpretations. So it's not a bad source at all to pick from, I'd say.

A perspective doesn't necessarily mean *visual*; it's a relational thing. It really means the balance between the explicit and the implicit - the proportion of information which is unfolded into awareness vs that which is not. If the world is an eternal informational landscape, then one's perspective dictates the radius which falls within one's perception.

> Q2: The problem is that the Bible never (please correct me if I am wrong) conveys that God is the innermost person inside the person...

It kinda does, via metaphor. God, Jesus, all meant to be aspects of you, in the early interpretations. All that stuff about fathers and sons, seedtime and harvest, forgiveness and non-judgement. Unfortunately the subsequent religions (as distinct from the early Christian movements) flipped that around so that God was something external to be worshipped and pleaded with, rather than internal and to be attended to.

> Q2: To me the term "perspective" means that whatever you experience is a result of a specific manner of experiencing.

That still applies here.

On the landscape and radius, yes it's metaphorical. The notion of "proximity" depends upon the particular aspect we discussing. In this case, I'm referring to the ability to perceive outcomes.

Talking more plainly: right now, I may have set various intentions, but all I am perceiving is this room around me (simplistically speaking). However, I may have a *sense* of the next-moment, of outcomes through intuition. If I could "step back", although not 3-dimensionally, then I would have access to a greater degree of temporal or event information. We could call this our present "knowledge horizon" or something; but what it's trying to convey is that you can't have both a dynamic experience *and* the experience of the full set of outcomes.

What can I say? The Bible is a product of its time! That's why we have to rewrite this stuff in modern language periodically, as the old descriptions stop being understood. If those parables had been written "straightforwardly" they would have made no sense to the readers of the time. For instance, the ideas of "reality" and even of "person" probably did not exist in the way they are used now. The concept of even an individual distinct identity is relatively recent.

The Bible *as it is now* (the official selection, as it were), is obviously compiled from the viewpoint of a hierarchical religion with a certain power dynamic, but that doesn't mean the message is gone, if people want to use it as their entry point. (Not something I'm recommending; I'm more indicating that those who are already dedicated to Biblical studies might find the true message is not what they are being taught in Sunday School.)

It is unlikely Jesus was a historical character - probably an amalgamation of various stories and parables. Y'know, and the Old Testament is *fun*, right?

> Q2: But this "stepping back" is moving through a different from conventional dimensions. And a dimension is a narrative. That, by the way, is a recent insight I had: dimension is narrative.

For sure, yes! It's perhaps best to think of dimensions as, rather than spatial extents, rather as stories enfolded within stories, like an origami sculpture. I see the next level up from here by "folding" this room into itself spatially, and that's what leads me to the "higher" perspective.

Yeah, I'm not *recommending* the Bible as the go-to text for today, just saying that it was an attempt to codify this knowledge, rather than a bunch of little moral tales as it often seems to be presented as. On the historicity of Jesus, I mean that the stories themselves seem to be a patchwork of different characters; but then the Bible wasn't (I suggest) aiming to be a historical account so it doesn't matter much.

It's probably unfair to compare Buddhist texts with early Christian ones; I don't think they were on the same level. The Western texts don't seem to do abstraction very well; they don't really explain, rather they guide behaviour?

One of the nice things about idealism, of course, is that we can happily construct pseudo-spatial spaces consisting of meaning, and not have to suggest they are less "real" the "proper" dimensions - since we don't reify the physical concepts anyway.

I really like your description of orthogonal narratives - very evocative. We could also apply the notion in a more granular way: orthogonal facts. One could actually create mental structures for this, perhaps, and flip through them as part of a more general organising principle.

> Q2: The Bible was never meant to be a document about transcendence and thus, never about spiritual liberation. It's a document about law. What you can and cannot do as a human on Earth. The Bible is less a spiritual manual than it is an early codex of law. So the task of the Biblical authors is almost literally the opposite of someone who writes about liberative spirituatlity. The task of the Biblical author is to ground you in this here bad dream, and make sure you can't escape it. The point of the Bible is to clip your wings! It's to put you in a small cage.

> The Bible even for its day is *not* a subversive document! It's a conventionalizing document that brings you closer to convention and to the day's dogmas, and doesn't teach you how to snap free from those, which is what spiritual documents teach.
>
> This is why I am saying, compare and contrast Daodejing or Zhuangzi, which teach you how to snap free of dogma and convention, and the Bible, for example.
>
> So you can see why I am pretty down on the Bible. But I don't think the Bible is evil or absolutely bad in every regard or any such thing. It's a so-so manual of worldly law, for example, and a so-so piece of early literature, etc. But if liberation is your game, forget the Bible. And I don't mean just today. If we lived 2000 years ago, I'd still want to insist the same thing.

I don't agree with your assessment of the Bible. I see it as an attempt at a "how-to" manual; and early example of self help. It doesn't make sense to compare it to deeper texts, because it was never meant to be that - in fact, it was probably never meant to be a single book in the first place. As you imply, it was a bunch of oral stories, which got written down sooner or later, and combined with some other material that fitted the purposes of the 'publisher' of the day. We probably have to make a distinction, I suggest, between the original material and its purpose and context, and the 'collected works' and intention of the later compilation.

Hmm, pondering this: it's interesting that while the West has become more adept at abstract thinking, it has at the same time I think (as a culture) grown more literal. The older civilisations basically communicated in metaphor, it seems (perhaps due to that oral tradition), and what's happened here is that we've stratified: high abstraction - gap - literal structures. What we do here in our discussions, is perhaps the filling in of that gap, using the full spectrum of thought to make connections.

> > Q2: But do you at least agree with me that law-giving and spiritual liberation are mutually contradictory concerns?

There is the *possibility* that, through the application of law, one might gain insight from the experience - but I do think that it's more likely you have the experience but don't get the broader meaning. Yeah, I bet them desert fathers had a few more secret stories on the go... I think the re-inclusion of subjectivity might turn into a broader trend. It's *relatively* recently that "objectivity" was jumped upon to provide a simplifying concept to make it easier to create explanations. But a couple of recent approaches in physics are flipping it round and saying, let's start with the subjective angle ("private views") and, um, we'll worry about connecting things up "objectively" later. We may yet see a resurgence of, and a reunification of knowledge by, subjective ideas - if not idealism, exactly.

For the subjective view stuff, check out Christopher Fuchs' work on QBism. It's a fairly readable introduction. An interesting development, and (at last) a move away from many-worlds and all that other nonsense.

I wasn't talking about any particular approach, just that a revisiting of the subjective frame will lend itself to a folding back of "objective" knowledge. What the theoretical context for that would be, I don't know - it *might* be idealism, but I figure there would be a few stepping stones before it got to that.

[...]

That's how it is, in these circles. Constant conversations about "this sort of shit". Although mostly not on quite the same level. Remember, these interpretations of QM have *in some sense* been around a long time - they just fall out of favour, get forgotten, then come back in a new form. If you were to look back at the original discussions by Schrodinger, Bohr, and so on, you'd see similar threads. Sometime, in the 1970s I think really, fashion moved more definitely, but still - David Bohm and so on were still working on roughly the same areas.

Philosophically speaking, it's not. What's different is:

Quantum physics is a *mathematical* theory. Given a specific experimental setup, it gives you a list of potential outcomes, and tells you how likely each outcome is. When you conduct the experiment, the result will be one of those outcomes. That's it. It says nothing about what "a set of potential outcomes" means or what happens prior to the result being observed. Everything beyond that is interpretation, is philosophy. Some interpretations (many-worlds) say that each potential outcome is "real" and actually occurs. Others, say that the list is simply a probability structure. Some say that that the situation itself is actually in an indeterminate state (rather than simply being unpredictable) and "collapses". So...

QBism's advance, if we want to call it that, is to interpret these lists of potential outcome and their likeliness as being a description of your *personal-view informational state* (sort of).

So, quantum physics itself doesn't change as such, but it is recast in a new light, and there's also the possibility of exploring the mathematics differently.

Well, I'd say that quantum physics is a particular thing. There may be *another* particular thing along later which will re-contextualise it and lead to further developments. The problem with quantum mechanics is that, *inherently*, there is no experiment that can be performed to distinguish between the interpretations. You have hit the observation limit, in a sense.

Yeah, QBism is for physics, not for living™

It's interesting to note parallel developments in thought across multiple disciplines, but each has a different aim. My own is: deeper understanding of the nature of experiencing which is applicable to change, for me and my pals!

> Q2: That's why metaphysics (and by extension philosophy) are going to continue to be necessary endeavors for humans.

Indeed. There was a flurry of so-called scientists talking about the end of philosophy a while back. Fortunately, wiser heads wrote vocal articles pointing out the flaws in this.

Real science is *very* personal. Science just *is* people, really. I was in the business, for a bit (as a student), and it's not really objective and detached at all, of course, as the movies would have you believe. Also: lots of boozing. I'm glad I exist too! ;-) Thanks. It's kinda great, how stuff like this forms from nowhere, and becomes a thing, and likeminded folk find each other. We've had some really great and fulfilling discussions over the last year.

[...]

> Q2: Remember what happened when I was exposed for the first time to your style of thinking? How many questions I was asking? Things like "enfolded" and "unfolded" made absolutely no sense to me. Well, just how many people have been asking you about that stuff besides me?

With the "imagination space + patterning" type metaphors it's much more intuitive generally. Since I've got people actually using that to update perceptions and create changes, it's much easier for them to connect to direct experience (which is of course the aim).

Quite so! I think context is the key to understanding that phrase, and too many organisations provide the wrong context.

Reply to “Paul Levy - Recognizing the Dream Like Nature of Reality”

> Q: There are only 6 ways you can experience: 5 senses and mind. Anything else you think is different is just a product of the mind.

A more straightforward way to begin investigating this (rather than jumping ahead as some of the earlier responses have), is the recognition that *all* of those things occur in the mind - by which I mean the "aware perceptual space" that you seem to be, that all your experiences arise in, be that "the senses" or "perceptions" or "thoughts".

That's basically the starting point for idealism, in fact: What is the nature of my direct experience, prior to my deductions about it? What things to do I know for certain? And what things are actually part of a constructive narrative?

> Q: Yes I agree with you the perceptions can't occur without the mind, but that doesn't imply that there is not anything outside that is causing such effect.

It implies that it is *meaningless* to talk about something outside the mind - since you will never experience such a thing. In fact: are there any spatial boundaries to the mind?And logically speaking, something which has an effect on the mind would also need to be made of the same "stuff" that the mind is made of. So: what *is* the mind made of? Both of those questions can be answered directly, right now, in your present moment experience.

The argument is, roughly:

...that in your direct experience, everything appears in "awareness" and is made from "awareness" (or consciousness, or whatever you want to call it). It also has no boundary. That is your starting point. You will never experience anything that does not appear within that, and of that. Furthermore, any thoughts you have "about" an outside or other materials or properties, will also be within that, and made from that.

So how does it make sense to talk of something outside of it, or made from something other than it?

Extras - Do you ever experience your brain doing anything or translating anything? In fact, do you ever experience "a brain"? When you talk of "a property your brain can translate as experience", what form would that "property" take and how *exactly* would it translate it from that form in into the form of "experience"? Finally, if you are imagining that right now as - what form is that imagining taking? Is it not a thought, within awareness, made from awareness?

I'm trying to save on quote marks here. ;-) But I don't believe I *did* talk about any *actual* external things, things external to awareness. What would those be?

Actually, forget subjective idealism for a bit - really it's all about two aspects:

- There is the relative *content* of experience.
- There is the fundamental *nature* of experience.

You can argue about the first one, but the second one is something that's pretty much a direct experience which is available and cannot be argued with (it just "is"). Idealism is the interpretation of the former, in terms of the latter - whereas most schemes don't even consider the latter, adopting a naive view of perceptions and conceptualisation.

So it's fine to talk about brains and the world and all that stuff, but in the background we recognise that those things all occur in the same context, of patterns within awareness. Literally look around right now, and recognise that this is all arising within your mind-space, include your body sensations and so on. In other words, your direct experience is of being an "open space" in which sensations, perceptions and thoughts arise. *Any conclusions you draw beyond this, are narrative fictions, abstractions.*

For example, the idea that "the world" is of the same format as your present moment right now, is an assumption. Given the above, in what sense is the room next door actually "over there"? Spatial extent is *part of an experience*, it is not a necessarily a property of the world as such, just as the colour red is not a property of the world, and so on. So idealism is really saying: throw away assumptions, start from what you know to be true directly, and build out from there - all the way avoiding the reification of abstractions.

Note - I'm not trying to sell the perspective here or persuade you of anything; I'm just trying to describe it so that you understand what it actually is.

Reply to “The question that would reveal everything to me.”

> > OP: Do I, or any other perceiving being, have the ability to choose without being conscious of the choice being made? Or to put it in another way; if subjectivity is true, and I create all of my surroundings, then how is it that I do not recall choosing my surroundings? Did I do it beforehand and then choose to do a memory wipe or do I choose in this moment what my surroundings should be?

It's because you have *accumulated patterning*. "Choosing" is an experience; relative creation is a shifting of state. They are not the same thing. You do not experience shifting as such, you only experience states.

Pretty much you don't choose your surroundings and actions *specifically*; they are simply logically implied by your current patterning, as part of that patterning. All this means your current state logically implies your entire experience right now and forever. Which means fundamental creation has already occurred, always - all you can do is *redistribute the relative intensity of contributing facts* via intention (=summoning a particular pattern or fact into greater prominence). Meanwhile, observing something in the senses is equivalent to "fixing" a particular fact, increasing its contributing intensity to a maximum, which is why subsequent experiences tend to be coherent with prior observations.

When it comes to intentional change and the final result ("do I choose my surroundings in detail?"), a useful metaphor to consider is that of moire fringes. Say I take one pattern and then intend another pattern over the top - can I *pre-know* the resultant pattern before I experience it? I cannot. Note that *calculating* the resultant would also be an experiencing of it.

For example, imagine a red car right now. Did you draw it in detail? No, it pretty much just *autocompleted* from the words "red car" into a particular instance of a red car. You could not have anticipated the form of the resulting car prior to its appearance in the senses. You had the experience of intending "red car" but you could not at that moment say you chose the actual car. Of course, if you take all the little intentions that have occurred over all time, all your accumulated patterning, then you *did* choose the exact red car in a sense.

Summary - You do not recall choosing because you do not generally choose your surroundings specifically. Creation does not occur in the way you are assuming. It is more like having a certain list of facts or patterns, whose distribution of relative intensity constitutes the "world-pattern" from which your ongoing sensory experience arises.

On the "choosing" thing, I'm pointing out that choosing itself is an experience apparently unfolding in time, the experience of choosing ("hmm, this or that, let's see") whereas a state shifts applies over all time, outside of it.

So, I'd say our disagreement is only because you are describing things in time. The subconscious mind doesn't fill in any details *as such* - the environment really *is* already there, you might say; it's just that it's very dim. Associative triggering brings it into brightness. That triggering itself happens outside of time too.

In other words, the full pattern of all experiences is within the current state, although it *seems* to unfold in time (because we've got a "things unfolding in time" pattern in our state). That's why we can *know* what's happening "next" - it's because it's already sat there, in a pre-existing landscape. Nothing is every created, it's

just that the relative contours of the landscape are adjusted. That's why things can seem to be generated instantly.

> Q: What caused the patterns to accumulate?

Strictly speaking, we should say something like "redistribute" or "reshape" the world-pattern rather than "accumulate", but it's easier to think of each intention as the addition or overlaying of a pattern onto a notional baseline. We should think of the world-pattern as an already-existing landscape, which is modified by intention (actually, its modification *is* intention and vice versa). Where did the initial state come from? It didn't - it exists outside of time and is eternal. But since our intentions appear to occur to us in time, accumulation of modifications is an intuitive way to think of it.

> Q: Also if I intend to do something, didn't I just choose to intend?

We also need to be careful on our phrasings when referring to intention. So "intend to do something" might be better termed as "intensifying the fact of 'experiencing this action at this specific time'". But you can equally intend other, more general facts, or even quite abstract patterning.

Meanwhile, it's perfectly possible to have the experience of choosing and then the experience of doing, and there be no *intending* involved, if those experiences are already baked in to the landscape. And one can also intend without having the experience of choosing first, in the sense of weighing up options - although one might have the experience of ceasing to change shape, based on a feeling of coherence. It's a direct shifting. Not easy to put into words. *But...*

In terms of your question, "how is it that I do not recall choosing my surroundings", it's because there is always a landscape (in the sense of a world-pattern of facts, and also in the sense of a "world as content"); there are always surroundings. Your intentions can shift or define that landscape - and intending to update one element will involve a shift in the whole landscape since all intentions apply globally - but you do not need to have the experience of "choosing" it for it to be there.

Okay, that wasn't as clear as I'd have hoped, but the core to all of this anyway is: content is not created in the same sense as, say, a games programmer deliberately creates a world, through selection and in time. Right now, the landscape of experiences is laid out, including the experience of choosing. That experience itself doesn't cause or do anything, that's an illusion due to the fact you only have one part of the landscape in the senses at a time. (Back to: experiences are local; intentions are global.)

> Q: I wanna add another question. What happen with other people? Is it not a conflict that everybody choose their surroundings?

Everyone *is* their own copy of the world. At least in the sense that everyone is a conscious space which has "taken on the shape of" a particular state, from which arises an experience of *being-a-person-in-a-world*. This means that we are not sharing the world in the sense of sharing a *place* (in space and time); it is more like we are sharing a set of potential experiential patterns.

> Q: That doesn't answer my question. What does happen with everybody choosing their surroundings?

Everyone gets what they choose (within the limits of their own habitual patterning). As I said, the world is not a place.

[...]

> Q: All choice is done without the chooser being aware of the choice being made. Choice is an illusion of the brain. Sam Harris's lecture on free will explores this phenomenon quite rationally and I'd recommend you watch the whole thing, but I've linked to the most relevant section. Sense perception is our only awareness of an external reality, yet...

This *seems* a bit muddled, because on one hand you talk of a brain "doing" things, and on the other you talk of a non-spatial and non-temporal consciousness. If things simply *are*, then it what sense does "a brain" do anything at all? What *is* a brain, in that case? If you catch my drift.

The point I'm really getting at is, and I could have been more specific perhaps: In your story of experience there, do you really need "a brain" as the substrate of your experience? What would your brain be made of? How *exactly* would your brain "cause" the sense of individual identity? Also, in what sense does consciousness *cause* reality? Does that mean reality is something different than consciousness?

From the subjective point of view (given the topic of this subreddit), would it not make more sense to dispose of the concept of a brain entirely, since we will never actually experience such a thing, and instead stick to what we can observe, which I suggest is:

- That our experiences arise *within the context of* an open awareness or consciousness.
- That our experiences arise as *patterning of* that open awareness (they are "made from" it).

More directly:

- The fundamental *nature* of experience is consciousness; the relative *content* of experience is patterns within consciousness.

We might see "brains" (grey lumps of stuff) *within* our experience, but we never experience *being* a brain - we only ever experience being consciousness, consciousness taking on the shape of an experience.

I think you are still implicitly *beginning* with a notion of a spatial world unfolding in time, and then placing experience *within* that. However, it doesn't really matter for the larger point.

On the solipsism issue - I'm not proposing a solipsistic view because I'm not talking about individual experiences, rather I'm talking about experiences which are of apparently being an individual.

Consciousness itself is "before" division or change; it is before multiplicity or relativity. We might use terms like "parallel-simultaneous", or use the *metaphor* of there being different experiences occurring at the same time, or sequentially, but actually we can't really speak of it at all, because "spatial extent" and "unfolding time" are themselves experiences, and out thoughts are formatted in those terms. It is already "too late" to speak of that which is before the experience. There is no context that can be thought of or described.

For convenience, I tend towards that metaphor which describes the world, rather than being a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time", as a "toy box" of potential experiential patterns, because it circumvents: the mistaken impression of "parallel" or "simultaneous" experiences; the idea that there is a world that is "happening" other than the experience of it; and the idea that there is an experiencer or "doer" separate from the experience or the "happening".

On the issue of subsets - Again here, we have to be sure to avoid the idea of there being a selection in space or time - which means we also cannot have creation events within our model. The dodge for this is to say that all possible patterns already exist, and all that changes is their relative contribution, constituting a particular state. In effect, an eternal landscape whose terrain can be adjusted by *becoming* a different set of contours - by *shape-shifting* into a new form. ("Intention" is the name for the relative intensification or reduction of one of the patterns which constitute that landscape.)

As always, though, these are conceptual tricks to some extent - the direct experience is much simpler!

Well there you go. It *does* seem that a lot of our conversations here come down to terminology. Nature of the business of nature, I suppose.

Reply to “So I just watched a video that I think you all may be interested in”

> OP: Also, T-George has a daily releasing exercise that is similar to meditation but maybe easier? If someone could link that, that would be great.

Here you go:

Daily Releasing Exercise

Every day, for 10 minutes, lie down on the floor in the constructive rest position: feet flat, knees up, hands resting on abdomen, a couple of books under the head so that it feels supported. Lie down in this position and give up, play dead. Give yourself to gravity, the universe, whatever. Let go of your body, your mind and - particularly - let go of controlling your attention.

Allow your body and mind and attentional focus to shift and move however they want. And if you happen to notice yourself "holding on" again, gripping anything, just let go once more.

Now, sometimes you might find that your attention narrows on a particular sensation, which then intensifies, peaks, then releases, after which your attention opens out again. That is fine. Just let that happen. Let anything happen, for those 10 minutes.



> OP: Hey, thanks for reposting that. You know, I don't recall the "knees up" being apart of it, is that new? Curious why you say to that, is it to keep one from getting drowsy from lying down?

It's just what happens when you put your feet flat on the floor! Knees together might be a better way of saying it. Anyway, the linked image makes it clear what I mean, hopefully. The reason for that particular position is that, if you have no residual tension, you'll be completely relaxed into the ground - and if you do have residual tension, your body will eventually run out of energy maintaining its position, hence "release".

It puts your body in the ideal posture in terms of lower back and neck positioning, particularly the tilt of your pelvis. Which is also why you do it on the floor, rather than on a soft surface (which just tends to support your current posture with held tension). The idea isn't to "feel relaxed" so much as to eventually release into full support, which translates into effortless standing and movement later (and other things too of course).

Reply to “Intention and nonduality”

> OP: TL;DR: Intent seems to be one of those fundamental non-things that we can't search for in experience. Yet, we can more directly know it through non-attachment...
>
> ...The next step then is, how to intend more directly? How to step behind experience and generate it?

I'd say you can't get behind anything, because you *are* everything. You are the "open aware space" which "takes on the shape of" the world, of experiences. Specifically, at the moment you have taken on the shape of *being-a-world-from-the-perspective-of-a-person*.

You don't generate anything, you *are* it and you *become* it, and between intentions you remain static (the apparent unfolding of sensory experience is a static pattern). It's probably better thought of as a pre-existing state or landscape, a world-pattern consisting of a relative distribution of facts or patterns (including a "time passing" pattern) which you can amend the contours of, thus changing which facts are most prominent and so changing your subsequent experience. To "intend" is therefore to shift your own shape as this landscape, and all intention is direct, in that it involves amendment of this landscape. However, some intentions or re-shapings will correspond more directly and obviously to sensory experience than others.

How to intend?

Well, there is no technique, and any attempt to "do" intention is doomed to fail, since it involves you identifying with one part of experience and trying to act upon the other part (which is impossible anyway), to partial collateral success at best. How does one shift one's shape? You-as-open-space simply becomes the new state, the new pattern. For direct intention (in the sense of directness of result), basically you *just decide*. This might be most accessibly described as "thinking an unbounded thought that something is true" or "asserting a fact" or "summoning a pattern in mind". If that is problematic, you can assign meaning to another act, mental or physical. You *decide* that, say, that conjuring this mental image *means-that* this thing is true, or that performing this ritual *means-that* this event will happen. Of course, this is a trick: you are still intending directly in the sense of asserting a fact, it's just that you are asserting one that *implies* the desired fact as an extended pattern. This distracts you from the fact that the conjuring of the mental image was by intention, as were the physical movements. You could just have intended the result without the intermediary, immediately updated the landscape, and experience would have apparently flowed towards it naturally, provided you did not resist what arose (thus re-intending against it).

(This also leads to the observation that: *experiences are apparently local, intentions are actively global*.)

The ideal?

The ideal approach is to perhaps begin with asserting that we are an open space in which experience arises - and then cease opposing sensory experiences from that point on, and to only occasionally intend particular facts into prominence. Otherwise we are thrashing our landscape, rippling the water of our world. Our experiences happen by themselves, but leveraging this requires an apparent relinquishing of control, in order to gain full control.

Where the metaphors come in, as I see it, is in that intermediate zone where we try to connect one perspective to another - for ourselves initially, and in our conversations with others later. Basically, re-encoding it to build a bridge between worldviews that allows people to move from *thinking-about* things to *direct-knowing* them.

But once we've got there and we realise our nature directly, it's all much simpler: the thought (pattern) of something *literally is that thing* (albeit without a context) and that applies to *"me"-as-person* as much as anything else. Then, metaphors take on a new role: they are not just for description, they are for actively *formatting* yourself. We realise that's how they worked all along, that's how we came to our new understanding. An act of explanation is also an act of creation, or creative reshaping at least. There's really nothing else to say at that point.

Reply to “I'd like to correct something I said in my last post”

It's worthwhile, I think, to distinguish between passing thoughts (which we might say arise from the current state) and intentional thoughts (which we might say are amendments to a patterns's contribution). So, passing thoughts don't matter, but intentional thoughts do - and what matters is the contextual meaning of those thoughts beyond just the standard sensory aspect.

For instance, you might conjure the image of an owl in front of you. Now, do this for "an owl" and do this for "an owl next month". The visual and auditory aspects might be identical in each case, however the *felt-knowing* of each will be different.

Relevance to the topic? That you don't need to let go of the idea as such, but the details matter. If the context of your idea is "an owl will happen soon", then holding onto that idea persists it as never happening, since you are continually re-asserting the fact of a *future* experience. Also, when you do something you can "know that it is done", thus implying its persistence, and then not have to continually hold it in attention. If you have the idea that ideas are transitory and need maintained while doing your intention, then you are implicitly intending that too, potentially.

Reply to “Solidity is reinforced through continuity”

> OP: My theory is that we tend to live in a primary default dream and occasionally dream secondary or tertirary dreams...

When I was playing with the idea of "strands of thought", that's how I was thinking of things. It leads to interesting questions as to the importance of the primary strand. It's not strictly *necessary* that there is one strand which is more stable, bright, 3D-immersive than others - I can see no need for stability in and of itself, prior to its formation, since stability is required in order to have the ability to reflect upon how nice it is to be stable. However, it's probably *inevitable* that one will arise eventually and become the effective default to which other strands collapse, until that primary strand itself collapses.

Following the collapse of the current *apparently primary* strand, I suppose either another strand will be revealed, or another strand will simply unfold from the logical fragments of the collapsed strand. "Experiencing" will always continue, being as it is the "container" for all strands of experience. The question really is: at the moment the strand collapses, are you identified with part of the content of the strand which is dissolving, and therefore you continue in ignorance of your prior experience? Or have you become identified with the "container" or *the nature of experiencing itself*, and therefore can *knowingly* continue, since your stability is now (almost) independent of content?

(Obviously, "strands" and "dreams" are concepts we are using. We *infer* they exist for our little model, but I'd suggest that the actual experience is simply one of ongoing content with no true hierarchy. The structure of experience needn't necessarily support a time-and-continuity framework at all.)

[...]

The *experience-of-something* is a real experience, but the *"something"* is not real beyond the experience of it. In the sense that there is nothing "behind" the content of an experience. Sand horses aren't made from "horse", typa deal.

Yeah, I've been keeping an eye on things, but not had much to say that wouldn't be just interjecting for the sake of it. Not that this usually stops me, mind you! :-)

Reply to “Have any of you made it to the mental plane?”

You'll need to expand a bit on what you mean by that.

> > cosmicprankster420: in some occultism there is a hierarchy of the physical>astral>mental and spiritual plane. The mental plane is the one beyond the astral i think in this context

Ah. Isn't that where you go pretty much every night? By which I mean, the unstructured void space in which environments are created.

[Nefandi: Have you made it to a non-mental plane?]

Reply to “You are constantly shifting dimensions already - Bashar”

Let's not become yet another sub where people just post "shit they found"! (I know you have the best intentions, so this isn't meant to be against you. It's a more general response.) I was originally going to set up an AutoModerator rule as has been done elsewhere, which bounces posts which are just links or which have no additional input or perspective from the poster. But we generally don't get a lot of it anyway (maybe due to the guidelines or because people feel that it's not appropriate).

Bashar is interesting, but links to his stuff appears on every "non-standard" subreddit, and there's not much value in it unless you say how exactly it ties in with the subreddit. It's just spam otherwise. See for instance: a previous time a Bashar link was posted. It doesn't necessarily take much more than that (although more would be encouraged now, I'd say). For instance, do you agree that we are "constantly shifting dimensions already"? Do you think it's a useful concept? If so, tell us why and start a discussion. Have you actually used this perspective and got results which have been beneficial or interesting? (Personally I think it really muddles up a couple of different ideas, and actually makes it harder to conceive of how to make a deliberate change in your experience.)

You get the idea.

> Q1: Muddle up in what way? Could you expand?

It effectively designates each "sensory frame" of experience as a "dimension" - which isn't very helpful.

It is better, I would say, to designate a "dimension" as being a particular distribution of facts - or *state* - which implies a particular set of experiential moments, as a deterministic path. That way can reserve the concept of "shifting dimensions" as being for an *intentional change of the underlying facts or state*, which effectively defines a new deterministic experiential path "as if" we were in a different dimension. (In actual fact, we never go anywhere, of course. We just have different content arise in our open awareness.)

Things like surrender, allowing, faith and intention all make more sense under this model - and it ties in nicely to the observable nature of our direct experience too, and how it relates to *intending* (which is the only thing which ever happens). With this, rather than being only a sort of abstract concept with "frequencies" as the bridge, "dimensions" become more clearly about the patterning of experience itself/ourself. In the end though, all of this stuff is metaphorical. We have experiences "as if" it were true, just as we tend to have experiences "as if" the world were a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time", rather than more of an "infinite gloop" with us the experiencing container. So we should all feel free to pick the descriptions that we find most attractive - just so long as we remember that this doesn't correspond to "how it is really, behind the scenes" (because there is no "behind the scenes"), and that sensory content has no causal power.

> Q1: You're already constantly shifting dimensions = you're already constantly fiddling with your felt sense of the world via intent.

Although you *shouldn't* be, I suggest? That's one of the aims to have, I'd say: to not be constantly thrashing your world around via reactive intention to the current sensory experience. Otherwise you are doomed to spend your life trying to "maintain a vibrational state", and so on. As for "dimensions", I feel that defining the

term so broadly makes it essentially meaningless, since it means you are never "in" a dimension at all, again encouraging that "fiddling and forever maintenance" mindset.

But... I'm of the "whatever works for you is good" view overall. The problem I have with Bashar (despite all the ET stuff which is fun but distracting) is that it doesn't really go anywhere in terms of leading to methods (or non-methods), or to realising the nature of your experience and so being able to build out from that. Now of course, the Bashar audience is not really the philosophical or metaphysical audience, nor is it the "post-magickal" or nondual audience, so it's a different perspective. For me, it kinda just adds another separate strand to the New Age / LOA realityshifting catalogue, rather than consolidating it into a useful worldview that connects to direct experience.

> Q1: Every second you shift to a completely new and different objective dimension.

I'm not so sure where "objective" comes into this?

> Q2: I feel the Bashar, although interesting in his thoughts, doesn't give any practices that might help people start thinking the way his teachings propagate. Correct me if I have missed any such practices. Most masters have given some techniques that will help us see or experience better, but Bashar just tells us what should the state be but not how to reach to that state.

He also doesn't tell you what a state *is*. Most importantly though, as far as I know he doesn't connect his concepts to your ongoing direct experience. Without that bridge, there's effectively no descriptive model (even one that recognises itself as metaphor), and so he can offer no practical approach other than vague notions of "frequencies" or "tuning in".

(When we say "practical", that doesn't necessarily mean actions - because actions are "before" experience in this case, since the root of it all is intention, and nobody can tell you how to intend. However, that itself is something that needs to be covered when talking about "dimensions" or whatever other scheme we're using.)

> Q2: Maybe that is why most religions dissuade channelling? Because these other species can't fathom human limitations? When Bashar talks, I feel like he's irritated at some of the "silly questions" that people ask, as if they should know such "basic things". BTW, I have yet to understand what the importance or application of "metaphor" is in Oneirosophy.

I suppose that rather depends on what you think "other species" are, and what "you" are, and so on. But I think that organised religions (as distinct from the originators of the ideas that seeded them) dissuade channeling because it makes you your own authority. After messing about with such things, you are in danger of discovering that it is *you* who are, in effect, God - albeit a different sort of "God" than the one usually taught in church.

On metaphors: It is my view that by deliberately adopting a metaphor (or a conceptual structure more generally) you can reformat or "pattern" your state such that your subsequent experiences arise "as if" it were true. Furthermore, there is no sold underlying substrate to our experience other than such patterns. (Of course, the idea of "patterning" is itself such a metaphor.)

So, the idea is that there is no fixed world from which your experience arises.

Looking around the room you are in now, for example, you see walls and the screen you are reading this on, and hands interacting with the device (all assuming things are well). Generally, we assume there is a fixed and solid world "outside" that is feeding us this sensory experience. *That* would be the "solid substrate".

However, we never experience such an outside world. We only ever experience... *experiencing*. And all of your experiences, although they might seem to be "about" objects and rooms and so on, they are made from this "experiencing", and everything arises in "mind". *This is no solid world behind your experiences.*

What you have, in other words, are habitual patterns with nothing underneath them. The way to confirm this, of course, is to try to change that "patterning" and see if your experiences change accordingly - perhaps indirectly at first, such as repeatedly bringing about outcomes that you want, to the extent that it cannot be explained away by coincidence or confirmation bias.

Reply to “How would you detach from reality in an easy manner?”

> [A1: From my experience, you would need to have zero fear and absolute trust that everything will work out and be ok no matter what is happening and then start acting exactly as you would if you were in a lucid dream. I went through a process like this and blew through a lot of fears by surrendering and being willing to experience them: going insane, death, dying a painful death, ending up in hell, etc. And as I did so the more reality started becoming basically a lucid dream as I treated it as such.
>
> The problem though is that the more I did this the faster things began to accelerate and my mind wasn't able to keep up with what was happening and eventually it felt like I was going to destroy not only myself but my whole dream world/universe, which I didn't realize were one and the same at the time and I had no spiritual background or wisdom at the time to know what I was getting myself into or what to expect.
>
> There's a saying in zen that would have helped tremendously for me to have understood at the time that says, "All fear is an illusion. Walk straight ahead no matter what." I think for one to actually believe that though when the time comes, they would have need to have heard it from someone they absolutely trust or have enough understanding of why it is true for it to actually be helpful.]

[There's a saying in zen that would have helped tremendously for me to have understood at the time that says, "All fear is an illusion. Walk straight ahead no matter what."]; I've never encountered that saying before, but it gets directly to the heart of it.

Ultimately, if you want to have dramatic things happen, you have to "be okay with *whatever* happens" and not block the unfolding of the patterns you have made - you can't be re-intending every time an uncomfortable feeling or apparently "incorrect" sensory scenario arises. Doing so results in you "thrashing your world" due to repeatedly intending something then re-asserting the previous state once the "out of control" or "happening by itself" feeling comes up (which commonly accompanies change).

The whole thing about "surrender" and "allowing" and "non-attachment" is really about the recognition that, although we might intend a specific target experience, we do not deliberately select the sequence of moments which arise between "here" and "there", and so we must *give up to the mystery* as the unknown path unfolds. Definitely a good question to ask ourselves is: *Am I constantly unwittingly re-asserting my starting state?*

> [[Q1: [*we do not deliberately select the sequence of moments which arise between "here" and "there", and so we must give up to the mystery as the unknown path unfolds.*]; I like this, and it is true. But not give up to it in some manner of defeated surrender because we have no other options, but rather from an understanding that we ourselves are a mystery, and that there's no fear in mystery, or that which is mysterious.
>
> [*Definitely a good question to ask ourselves is: Am I constantly unwittingly re-asserting my starting state?*]; I'm not quite sure what you mean by starting state. Could you rephrase that for me?]]

You make a good point about emphasising that it's not surrender in the sense of giving up, it's surrender in the sense of *trust*. You are giving up the fight, because the right thing is happening, so there is nothing *to* fight.

To cover "starting state", let me reuse an example:

If you are sat in a chair, and want to stand up, you should intend *being-stood-up* and let experience unfold accordingly. If you approach it this way, your body will feel like it moves "by itself" and there will be a sense of effortlessness - because no muscle movement is occurring other than that required to shift position. (If you are feeling muscular effort, that is the feeling of creating effort, which means you muscles have done their movement bit, and are now doing something else.)

However, what people usually do is being this be re-asserting their current position. They begin by locating themselves *being-sat-down* and fully establish that before beginning. They then try to overcome *being-sat-down* by intending their muscles "manually" in order to get to *being-stood-up* - which they do by keeping being aware of *being-sat-down* throughout. In effect they are continually re-asserting their initial state of *being-sat-down* as part of their strategy for *being-stood-up*.

So, this is similar to people who try to make changes to the world in other ways, but do so by starting with the world as it is, or be constantly checking how they are doing by comparing where they are now vs the initial state (which simply re-asserting the initial state again, to a greater or lesser extent). This is really part of the broader problem where people try to be "over here" while making changes "over there", in space or in sequence. For example, wanting to fill the room with your 'presence', but attempting to do it while remaining firmly located in your body area, maintaining a mission control aspect. This can happen because people confuse being "detached" with being spatially located separate from the world. This is not quite what is meant. "Detached" really means "allowing".

> Q2: I really dislike the langauge of surrender because for me it evokes something external whereas you're trusting your own process of othering

Yeah, I don't think there's any single "best" way to phrase it. The language for "that thing where you stop interfering which feels a bit like things are happening to you but they are the things that you have already created" is pretty tricky, and I'm inclined to think it just depends on who's on the other side of the conversation. For someone whose main problem is that they are constantly grasping onto their sensory experience, "surrendering to the flow" type imagery probably capture the feel of it. So long as the context is one of being assertive in other ways - in other words, the reason you surrender moment-by-moment control is because you've already asserted the outcome - then it cane useful.

However, if it gives the sense of "surrendering to God's Will" *without also* informing you that "God's Will" corresponds to the landscape of *your* accumulated previous intentions and their implications (including any ideas you had about a "God"), then it's more problematic.

> Q2: Some of this is unavoidable if you want to have a sense of progression.

I don't really mean this in the sense of extinguishing your notion of the past, or your memory. I mean it in a much more straightforward way of not *re-asserting* the current state, by looking for it or implying it. The everyday example is, if you're getting up from a chair to go into the next room, you don't being by feeling out with the senses to find the experience of yourself sat down, and *then* try to manipulate that experience into standing up. You think only the fact of *being-stood-up* and allow your sensory experience to apparently flow towards that position.

Pushing this further, if we were to *teleport* from one room to another, how would that play out? We wouldn't be aiming to forget the memory of the room we started in, but we *would* be aiming to completely let go of the fact of *being-in-the-room*, to allow it to be replaced as a relative truth by the fact of *being-in-the-other-room*.

So that's the sense in which I mean not checking or comparing. It's perfectly okay to spend some time contemplating how much you've progressed. But when you are actually performing a state-shift, you should not be checking on your progress by bringing up the initial state for comparison, because that re-asserts that initial state again. You keep finding yourself sat down in the chair / un-teleported again!

[[Nefandi: I've been thinking about this stuff on and off the the past X hours, and I wanted to add this.

Firstly, I want you to remember that I still continue to respect your opinion. Nothing has changed in that regard.

Secondly, this explanation of teleport-only magick rubs me the wrong way. And I want to try to express why in maybe a better way.

But when I say "rubs me the wrong way" please don't take it to mean I completely disagree with it. I think it's a magickal equivalent of a nuclear weapon in *some sense* (more below), but nukes shouldn't be the only tools in my arsenal. I want big tools and small tools and medium ones. Changing an entire context at once is maybe easiest with a teleport-type intent. So I want this to be in my toolbox, but I don't want all my magick to be teleports for a number of reasons.

1. (intra-moment rigidity) The notion of teleporting suggests that each individual frame is inflexible internally, and the only flexibility exists in between frames during frame jumps. I don't agree with the premise.
2. (informational incompleteness) If we take the metaphor of a grid (you've been mentioning it in the past), there is a flaw in it. The flaw is that your *path* through the grid is not and cannot be recorded in any of the grid "squares." To understand this better, think of a movie film on celluloid. What order you choose to display the frames is up to you, and the order is not encoded in the frames themselves. It's extraneous information. So your grid model doesn't capture reality but is only a kind of mental stimulation exercise to get people to move off supposedly more stale ideas. So it's a nice exercise, but it's not anything I would take as a true model of reality, therefore magick based on it is approximate at best. I think it goes without saying teleport magick is strongly based on this grid model.
3. It's my lucid dreams. The feeling in my dreams when I am lucid and doing stuff is one of brutal and utter simplicity and directness. There is nothing tactical about intentionality there. So in an LD I generally don't do X to achieve Y. So if I want control, I control. I don't relax in order to have more control. I don't do that at all. I don't let go of myself to find myself. I don't do any of that popular stuff. On the contrary. Everything is very very direct and to the point. So a good explanation to my mind must not only be correct or powerful, but it must retain that aura of brutal simplicity, but it shouldn't be cartoonish either. So for example, I've failed many times in my lucid dreams but the solution has never for me been to let go more, or to teleport more. I've had to work on my confidence. I've had to face the fear of death or disfigurement for some transformations, and this is a type of letting go, but not exactly of the same kind you seem to talk about. For other transformations what helped the most is just doing them over and over and becoming accustomed to doing them. That's the

case with flying. So I've had to make some adjustments but generally it's not been the case for me where I just make a one size fits all adjustment all the time. Each situation is something I approached as an individual situation. In some cases I needed more creativity. In other cases I needed more ruthlessness or fearlessness. Each kind of failed transformation seemed to be pointing at *different* personal weaknesses of mine. So there was some character to it as opposed to like mowing the grass type thing, where the grass doesn't matter you just mow it all just the same. The cultivation of my abilities was not at all like a process of mowing the grass. (see grass -> mow it down).

That about sums it up I think. Maybe I'll think of an even better way to say it, but this is the best I got for now.]]

Quick thoughts:

There is nothing stopping you skipping from one "frame" to another in my description, other than refusing to release your current state, or somehow re-asserting it. By "refusing to release your current state", I simply mean not continuing to assert aspects of the current frame (sensory aspect *or* implied pattern *or* fact), so that it can shift. You can't stand up if you keep focusing on the sensory experience of being sat down. The essence of a "patterning" approach is that there is *no* permanent solid structure at all, even though we have built up some habitual structure over time. If you look at the grid metaphor animation, for example, the starting and ending frames are totally disconnected. *All potential frames are simultaneously available and accessible.*

*The brutal simplicity underlying all this is:*You are an "imagination space" - that is the context. Sensory experiences arise within it, via patterning - that is the content. There are no restrictions on content. Changing the content means intending-imagining what you want (basically: intensifying the contribution of a pattern) while not intending-imagining something contrary to it, and hopefully not something that limits the manner it can appear to manifest by.

Everything beyond that simple account, is a description of *specific patterns* which we already have, or which have benefits if we format ourselves with them. This is the idea of "Active Metaphors" - you intensify a metaphorical pattern, and your ongoing experience starts to align with that metaphor.

So if we wanted to have the experience of teleporting, then for sure we could just intend fully and do a "frame jump", since there is no fundamental underlying mechanism to things other than intending-imagining them happening. However, another approach is to introduce into your world a mechanism or fact, to make it possible as part of the content of your world rather than an exception or jump outside of it - e.g. the "infinite grid" or whatever.

Looping back to your points:

1. For convenience, a "frame" is just any particular sensory arrangement. So it doesn't really make sense to say that a frame would be flexible internally - because that would be another frame. (Remembering, though, that the concept of "frames" is just a handy metaphor; experience is not really arranged that way, although it can be formatted to behave "as if" it were.)
2. Think I've tackled that above. There is no true model of reality. However, models can be useful for coming up with ideas for "as if" experiences.

3. I agree with what you say about "confidence". Really what one wants is to fully *be* the entirety of content and then *shape-shift*. There is no technique to that, and it is always true anyway, however we can get stuck *imagining-that* we are not this.

   Stuff like "letting go" is just one way to *relax the division* and settle out into being the entire space and all that's within it. It's not letting go of control as such, it's letting go of (spatial) attentional focus and, counter-intuitively, becoming fully attended as a result.

   It's also letting go of re-intending the current state, to allow yourself to shift. I say "also", but in effect the two turn out to be the same thing. Holding onto attentional focus is one of the last ways, having allowed body and thought to flow, that we subtly restrict our shifting of state.

Okay, I ended up typing a full response there, but perhaps it clarifies where I'm coming from and how it connects with your comment.

> Q2: I have a question. Don't you ever get scared? Do you ever get overwhelmed by experiences being much crazier than you bargained for?

I probably do feel scared quite often, just in everyday life. Or maybe "nervous" is a better word. Generally though, I find unusual situations - those which reveal things to be not as they seem - to be comforting rather than scary. Although it wasn't my conscious aim in exploring these things, when I reflect on it I think that the *mundane* version of the world would actually be much more scary.

So, I was probably quite a fearful child I think, and to some extent that stayed with me, but a counterintuitive side-effect of it has been that I've always been good for emergency situations when things go wrong - because I was comfortable with an ongoing sense of discord anyway. Unflappableness derived from baseline flappability? :-) For "this stuff" - mind and reality - I was interested in it from when I was in early high school, so I started playing with stuff like astral projection, did that thing of being super-scared of the onset of the experience, eventually committed to it. Over time you accept the fear as a feeling that comes up, and later when you have a sense of *being-the-context* as your identity you are more okay with the *content* that comes up, because it's within you rather than something external coming at you. So what's important is finding new moorings after unusual experiences have cut the ropes on the old ones. And being okay with *not-knowing* - the inherent mystery of not having pre-experience of your upcoming experiences - while also having confidence that intention is effective.

You still feel the feelings though. You're still having a "person" experience. But it's more like ripples in an ocean, rather than disturbances in a glass of water. You know, something I was pondering lately: I think it's quite common for people to *think* that they want a cool "glitch" or a "manifestation" - until they get it, and then they're suddenly not so sure. There *is* an anxiousness that comes with it, the anxiousness of intuiting that there is potentially no inherent stability or boundary? How would you phrase it?

The implications of "high weirdness".

- *The world is not a "place".* That's a pretty scary thing to realise. Anything might emerge from the "gloop"!
- *I am not a "person".* That's troubling too, initially. The stable foundation I thought I was, has no solidity!

Without anything to replace those two negatives, we are left with just The Unknown without any sense of trusting, and that can be scary. So the story of being okay with being scared, is to have a replacement for those? When you get a fear response with "reality" stuff, what sort of thing is it that you find shakes you?

Stacked Weirdness & Power

> Q2: I was feeling like I no longer knew what reality was, what was real and not, and then I started to get scared. Then I backed off toward normality again.

I think knowing that one can pull back is a definite advantage. It's an option we want - *"the right but not the obligation"*. At least then we can experiment and still feel safe.There is an issue that once you've allowed a level of weirdness to happen, it does tend to multiply and become dominant. It's not like you've tweaks a specific event, so much as adjusted a generalised fact, like having ticked the checkbox called "Enable Hyper-Associative Events" on your Life App, and the corresponding fact-pattern is now overlaid upon *all* experience.

In general, I'd say the more we react to a pattern, the more prominent it becomes. It doesn't really matter whether that's a positive intention or a negative reaction - anything that focuses on or even implies the existence of the pattern, intensifies it. And so we get that guy over at Glitch who had been fighting the ever-growing instances of "11:11" for decades, not realising that *anything* he does about it will persist it. This is the real danger I think: that if we don't twig, then we can end up battling against something we've triggered, and get swallowed by it. I had a dream once, where I was floating in the void. I came across an infinite invisible wall. I pushed and pushed and couldn't get past it. It started to feel very claustrophobic and unbearable. Finally, I took a step back... and just walked through it. I think that dream was maybe trying to tell me something at that time! :-)

> Q2: It's not as though I suddenly become more powerful myself.

In what sense do you mean, "more powerful myself"? If you are looking for the experience of feeling yourself "do" reality shifting things, then I'm not sure you are going to get that, since intention itself is effortless, and you sort of *are* the whole of everything. Or do you mean just having a more direct sense of the impact of your intentions?

> Q2: I feel something shifting inside me. It's like, "Oh... I used to feel like that.. but now I don't. Hmm..." That's the best I can describe it.

Ah, that's really interesting, particularly what you say about the less you need to make deals, the more powerful you become inside. As a general approach, I think it's very good to, when you realise you have attributed power to some "outside" imagery, to intentionally draw that back into yourself (metaphorically, but also that's not a bad way to imagine it).

> Q2: You mean not a human. You're still a subjectivity, which is also a kind of person. Just not a human or conventional person.

Yes. I think the phrasing of "not a human" sounds to a lot of people like we are claiming to be something *else*, like "non-human", but I like that term "a subjectivity" - it's similar to "a perspective" but without the implied point of view aspect.

Fear of the Unknown & Dreams

> Q2: Like for example that dream where I felt things got so real that if I didn't wake up, I'd be dreaming it as my life instead of my old life... I guess unknown can be freaky if you *expect yourself* to have some needs in the near future.

That was a really good example and description. So, it's a variant of "not knowing how the world works anymore" and the fear that comes with it. This can happen both in "this" world when weirdness starts happening (even when that means getting something we want), and in the "other" worlds of dreams and projections when we have no accumulated knowledge. I think perhaps we can prepare ourselves for this in our daly lives, and it's about building up confidence in something we rarely use. It doesn't necessarily required weirdness, but a sort of openness, in order to answer the question: how do I survive in an environment that I don't (think that I) know?

One of my little experiments used to be, to ask my body to go and find things, and then let it move by itself. The mild version of this was, to just ask to "know" where something or someone was. If I was late meeting up with friends and didn't know which bar they were in on that street, I would just ask my body to go to where they were. In both cases, you are intending an experience and then allowing it to arise - whether that's the experience of an action or the experience of a thought.

How doe this work? Well, if what you are is really a "subjectivity" who is currently having the experience of *being-the-world-from-the-perspective-of-a-person*, then all facts are available and all events are possible. One simply intends an experience, and allows it to unfold as overlaid upon the currently active patterning.

A couple of examples in the dream world where one draws upon knowledge implied by the situation, via intention, deliberately and not:

> [However, in order to progress in your dreams you will occasionally need to make a leap of faith. Make sure that you take them sparsely, and that intuition is on your side.
>
> I started walking into a direction that took me away from where I previously was. Putting my focus on something else put my body into auto-pilot. In this case I got the idea of the key being for my spaceship mid-way. (Spaceships use ignition keys, just like cars right? *cough*)
>
> My body automatically walked me towards where this spaceship is, even though I did not know where it was. Somewhere deep within my thoughts I knew that I had gotten to this space station somehow. If the key indicates that I own a spaceship, then I would have arrived in this spaceship, and I would also remember where I parked it.
>
> Putting myself in "autopilot" I can walk to locations that make sense for me to know within the dream plot, even if I don't consciously know where they are.
>
> *-- From Hyu's guide on Persistent Realms]*

and:

> [We went outside and he gave me the strongest bear-hug I've ever experienced. I couldn't breathe and soon became unconscious. It was like waking from a dream; this world was a dream and I awoke to a reality more real and vivid than this world is. I saw the illusion of this existence on

> Earth dispelled! It faded away and I didn't regret it. Soon I found myself in the "real" world in a huge city that I already knew.
>
> My memory seemed to return--Yes--I had gone to sleep and dreamed of a little place called "Earth" and now I was awake. "That was a silly dream" I thought, and I soon forgot all about "Earth." I continued my life, just like before I fell asleep. I lived in that fantastic city for years and years--centuries it seemed. I lived there so long that I COMPLETELY forgot all about Earth. For hundreds of years I had forgotten Earth. If someone was to ask me about it, I couldn't remember, since it happened so long ago.
>
> Then one day I was walking to a store. Suddenly a confusing loss of direction hit me and I felt myself falling. Suddenly I opened my eyes only to see strange leaves, the sky and FD and the other boy looking at me! Where was I now? How did I get here? What happened? Then I remembered: Hundreds of years ago, I fell asleep and found myself here. This place was called "Earth" and was a part of a weird dream. I must have fallen asleep again. Slowly my Earthly memory returned. I asked the boys how long I had been unconscious. They said only a few minutes. They asked me what happened, and I told them I didn't want to talk about it.
>
> *-- From Robert Peterson's OBE guide]*

In other words: **we do not need to fear the unknown.** Just because we have not explicitly thought about the knowledge, recalled it, does not mean that the "right action" is not available to us. In fact, right action is always available, because we never truly act, rather than *intend or imply outcomes* and experiences arise in line with those intentions. We can surely confirm this for ourselves in non-challenging everyday life and develop a confidence *for fun*, before putting ourselves in any situation where this would be required *for survival*?

> [[Nefandi: [I think knowing that one can pull back is a definite advantage. It's an option we want - "the right but not the obligation". At least then we can experiment and still feel safe. There is an issue that once you've allowed a level of weirdness to happen, it does tend to multiply and become dominant. It's not like you've tweaks a specific event, so much as adjusted a generalised fact, like having ticked the checkbox called "Enable Hyper-Associative Events" on your Life App, and the corresponding fact-pattern is now overlaid upon all experience.]; You're onto something here. Even with my ability to return back to normality, I feel there is a limit. It's like if I am walking into an ocean, and I can return at will so long as I don't wade more than say 10 feet away from the shore, because if I do, the waves and my inability to touch the bottom will potentially make it impossible to get back to the shore by foot. Then I have to swim. If I know how to swim, I can remove myself further from the shore before fear sets in. But if I swim so far that I no longer see the shore, the fear is back. Then I might know how to orient myself by the sun or the stars, but if it's dusk and cloudy, the fear's back. Etc.
>
> In other words, each new level of skill extends the safe range, but each type of skill has a limit. And, there is, I feel, something like a point of no return. I haven't gone over that point yet, and so I can still return easily and at will. Which is nice, but it's not *that* great of a comfort.

I think ultimately we can return to anything, but what's not always assured is the *easy* and *quick* return.

[In general, I'd say the more we react to a pattern, the more prominent it becomes. It doesn't really matter whether that's a positive intention or a negative reaction - anything that focuses on or even implies the existence of the pattern, intensifies it. And so we get that guy over at Glitch who had been fighting the ever-growing instances of "11:11" for decades, not realising that anything he does about it will persist it. This is the real danger I think: that if we don't twig, then we can end up battling against something we've triggered, and get swallowed by it.]; Meta-beliefs, beliefs about beliefs, have power. If you believe that interacting with a belief or an representation of belief in any way reinforces it, then it may be so. But that still doesn't mean it is universally so. It is so only provisionally, contingent on that meta-belief.

[In what sense do you mean, "more powerful myself"?]; When I open my heart door to allow more weirdness into my life, it always comes through the veil of othering. I feel like it's happening *to* me, and not like I am making it happen. I allow it to happen, but from that allowing forward, I am no longer in control of how, when, where, the details. So if I open my heart door right now, then in the next week a series of weird events will unfold, but I don't know how, when, where, etc. And when they unfold, I don't feel like I have a choice about what it is. So this is a very powerful othered intent. Heavily othered.

[If you are looking for the experience of feeling yourself "do" reality shifting things, then I'm not sure you are going to get that, since intention itself is effortless, and you sort of are the whole of everything. Or do you mean just having a more direct sense of the impact of your intentions?]; My intent has an inconceivable range. If you can imagine something, I can intend it. So for example, you often talk about yourself as though you're not acting in a powerful way, but are just watching your body act something out that you yourself don't think you can do in the body. But I've experienced power far beyond this. I can act as God. I don't need to play tricks with my body. I've erased and created universes with my body. I remember these things. So I know I can wield arbitrary levels of power in arbitrary configurations. I don't have to play tactical games. I often end up playing a tactical game similarly to what you describe, but that's only because there is an interfering belief with its associated life-pattern that I'd rather go around than face head on.

So for example, if I believe my in-body consciousness is dumb, I will tactically remove myself from the body and put my body on autopilot. That's how I go around the bad belief. But there is a way to remove the bad belief directly. And of course I don't mean the belief is bad in an objective sense. So if you see such a belief as overall good, it may actually make a lot of sense to use all these tactical intentions to preserve those structures that perhaps otherwise serve you really well. So maybe it's great that when you're in the body you seem to be deaf dumb and blind, and when you want to find your friends, you separate from the body, disown it, temporarily, do your trick, and then you're back to the excellent deaf dumb and blind in-body state as before.

I'm playing a slightly different game here TG. I don't like tactical stuff except as an intermittent reliance. I am more likely to accept a tactical intent if I myself thought of it. If someone else (including

> you) tells me "here's a tactical intent and it works because that's just how it is" I reject it on its face. In Daoism the tendency toward tactical intentionality is sometimes called "scheming and plotting," btw, and Zhuangzi talks about it often. I'm not a Daoist, and I actually don't give a rat's ass about Daoism, but it's a very similar understanding to mine. Tactical intents, if they're up against something unconscious, they spell trouble. And usually we need to use a tactical intent precisely *because* there is something unconscious that's sustaining a pattern.
>
> [Just because we have not explicitly thought about the knowledge, recalled it, does not mean that the "right action" is not available to us. In fact, right action is always available, because we never truly act, rather than intend or imply outcomes and experiences arise in line with those intentions.]; I think this is very true, but it's one thing to say it, and another thing to enter into this truth with, as they say, your very body.
>
> I very much appreciate your brilliant post TG, but it's not as though suddenly everything is obvious and easy to me. Not yet. I'm still going along the same path as before.]]

So, much of interest there (and your paddling and swimming imagery was nicely evocative). I'm thinking that perhaps they can be seen as pointing to a single idea perhaps, which also takes in that option to reduce our needs rather than fulfil them (or as a way of fulfilling them). It comes down to this idea of the "tactical" move and of "power".

I'm gonna riff on that a bit - I suggest that there is only one mechanism, only one thing that ever "happens" - and that is *intending*. Even the apparent actions and events that occur, they are not "happening", there are (metaphorically speaking) aspects of a landscape that is static between intentions. The experience of "time passing" is itself a static pattern.

This means that there's no such thing as "tactical" this or that, and no variation in levels of power - because *all that there is, is the "nuclear option"*. There is only one way, and that is the pressing of the big red button. Every intention is a reshaping of the landscape, and therefore *in effect* the complete destruction and then creation of a world. There is no path to power; the fundamental truth of the matter never changes. Having the experience of "feeling powerful" - that is just another sensory experience, and has nothing to do with power as such (except in the sense that one uses the true and only power in order to generate an experience of "feeling powerful").

Yes, I'd agree that if you can imagine something, then you can intend it, because imagining is an intending really - an intending of the experience of an image - and only a small adjustment is required to make it "real" - to intend it 3D-immersively rather than in a separate strand of thought. And this leads us to an important point I think...

What we intend is always *to have experiences*. Our intentions correspond to generating experiences "as if" things were true. Experiences themselves have no causal power - one moment does not cause the next moment, they just arise sequentially is all - so there can be no tactical or developmental strategy. You have intended an experience like "this", or you you have intended an experience like "that". The *content* of experience is itself actually irrelevant, other than personal preferences. What we are, is the *context* of experience - and having recognised this, we are freed from concerns about power, mechanism, and so on!

Sp, we may desire the experience of feeling ourselves "doing" our events, rather than experience them "happening to us", but it will just be another experience. Intentions are always "global", even though experiences may be apparently localised. Knowing this, we have a choice, and that is what matters. We can have... fun. If we switched our experience to one of "seeing the entire landscape" rather than just a partial view, then we'd be having an entirely static (although blissful) experience. We'd get bored pretty quick... except that there would be no time, so that makes no sense. :-)

What else is there, except for intention? There is no other method or mechanism - it's all sensory theatre. It doesn't matter whether it's small or large changes, moving your arm or moving a house, you are always intending: "intensifying the thought that something is true".

For sure, the "infinite grid" is imagination - but so is "the world as place" and anything else we can conceive of. That *is* the such-ness of things, and everything exists always. It's just a matter of how prominent that particular imagining or pattern is in our experience. Relative intensities of contribution. The world *is* ourselves as aware imagination itself, shaped into a particular form - and intention is the reshaping of ourselves.

So I'm not saying that the "infinite grid" or whatever is how things are - the opposite really. I'm saying there is *no* fundamental unchanging "how things are", other than ourselves-as-awareness taking on the shape of a state. Anything beyond that, is the form we have adopted. Fundamental truth (context) vs relative truth (content). And we are free to shape ourselves however we want.

However, this does in effect mean we are *always* using the nuclear option - the full power of God, as it were - because there is no other option. When I interrupt the flow of things and move my arm, I'm just intending the fact of arm movement, but actually I move as the whole world in order to do so, since there is no separation. The process is always: I shift state as a whole, and my subsequent sensory experiences arise from the new state.

And of course the world - as in, the complete description that constitutes its state - is static between intentions, between reshapings. If it wasn't, then that would imply there is a power outside of ourselves, even though we *have* no outside!

So, to emphasise: This isn't about the any particular approach we want to experience ourselves apparently doing; it's what underlies all apparent approaches - our nature. Beyond that we are completely free to do detail work or broad shifting however we please, for the simple enjoyment of it. (Knowing that all approaches are basically optional, chosen because they fit our views at the time, how comfortable we are with them. After all, there's not much point making changes for the sake of it - the purpose is to have fun or otherwise increase the quality of our experience.)

> Q2: Knowledge. There are different ways to conceive how experience should be structured.

Knowledge, I would say, corresponds to an aspect of "state", as distinct from intend-*ing* would be the change of state. Beyond that, of course, everything's up for grabs. How would you define "knowledge"?

> Q2: In some sense you always use the most powerful capacity of intent, but that's generally below the level of conscious awareness.

Well, that's quite the thing isn't it? You don't experience yourself intending *as such* because intending isn't a thing, and an intention isn't a thing but an aspect (although once can use an object to represent an intention). If you aren't "looking" at the part of the world you are shifting, then you won't experience anything - other than sort of very slight *felt-knowing*.

> Q2: You seem to ignore the relative problems that human or recent ex-human beings have. You can't answer a real life problem with theory.

Well, it does answer problems in the sense that it shows the relationship between aspects of experience - importantly, it highlights that no structures are solid, and that cause is intention and not in the content of experience - but then we progress to specific examples to illustrate this. I'm not sure what *exactly* your objection is, in terms of how it would relate to life and making changes? The base notion is of course just "relative intensities of facts = state ---> sensory experience". The conclusion is that you don't need to worry about mechanisms and techniques, except in the sense that you *imagine-that* you are doing something causal, then you are, and that if you decide something *means-that* another thing is true, that is cause. But nature of that cause is "the thought that something is the case". After that, it's playing with examples, to demonstrate that causal/acasual mix.

> Q2: If you teleport somewhere, the me that you'll meet there...

We actually just can't talk about that - it's meaningless to talk about "the you" that I will meet, right?

On fears, they really have to be tackled specifically. There's the general fear of change, which I think can be answered by recognising our true identity as the context of experience - but specific fears depend on their relationship to one's identify, I'd say, so there's some unpacking to do, unless you just commit to an outcome. Eventually, it's the story of developing trust?

> Q2: Intending is structured internally. For example, I intend to walk. I move my legs. I lean against my legs. That's the structure. There is ground. I push on it by leaning against this and that leg. So in order to intend something, one has to conceive of that something first. How you conceive of something is very important. So in the above example, Earth is a background commitment, which is also intentional. So an intent to walk works in the context of a commitment to an Earth-like environment (with up/down, etc., where movement via bi-pedal means is sensible). This I think is a much more insightful way to look at intent.

That is an *example* of an intention. I've been talking about intention more generally, and the implications of its nature on our understanding of the world, and how we would operate within it - or may *operate it*. Although I seriously hope you don't actually operate that way! ;-)

> Q2: [Knowledge] It is a mental form assumed with confidence and familiarity.

Hmm. Is that not an *experience* of knowledge? What is knowledge's actual form?

> Q2: And I found it profoundly unhelpful. It does not assuage any fears at all.

It seems we are talking at cross-purposes a little. I wasn't particularly aiming to assuage your fears!

But I would say, the only truly reliable, global way to deal with fears is to re-identify yourself as the container of experience. For as long as you're identified with a particular aspect of experience, of content, then there will always be fear of change, change that modifies it or dissolves it. The unpacking we do, I feel, is really us taking baby-steps towards that. Which is totally fine!

On trust - you could say confidence, perhaps. Really, it's faith that your intentions shift the world, and that even though you might not experience the outcome in the senses for a period of time - during which sensory evidence might even be counter to it - and you don't know the explicit trajectory in advance, that it has "worked".

Obviously, in the longer term, I *do* aim to assuage all your fears! :-)

Picking up on a couple of points which are key:

> Q2: [Although I seriously hope you don't actually operate that way!] I do! And I suggest so do you.

What I was getting at there: I really hope you don't manually micro-intend your body like that, or your thoughts, or anything - because you don't need to do that. If you intend an outcome, the rest is autocompleted. This is how we can insert "facts" and have the world fall into line. This is how we can be effortless. But...

It's also why you need faith. We may call it confidence built from experience, but you must eventually become comfortable with the fact that you do not "pre-experience" your experiences. If you intend an outcome, you will not know in advance how exactly that outcome will *seem* to come about. (Even if you did a "psychic preview" you would be *experiencing*.)

I get the impression sometimes that you see yourself as the *ongoing controller* of your experience. Now, you can adopt that approach certainly, but it really limits you to your immediate sensory theatre (as it were) plus what you unpack into your thoughts deliberately, rather than the world as a whole.

> Q2: [Knowledge] Why does it need an actual form?

It doesn't, necessarily, but if we don't explore the question, it's left as a nebulous idea which isn't bound properly to our ongoing experience and to our "power".

> Q2: I know all about the global teleport idea...

Well, it *seems* that you don't entirely get what I was saying, because you said that (for example) the infinite grid was "just" my imagination, which rather begs the question as to what the world is, in contrast, and so on.

> Q2: [Baby steps] That's how any real change happens.

It returns us to the "do problems solve themselves?" topic. If one intends an outcome of a solution, then does one *solve the problem* or does one *experience the problem unfolding into a solution*. The difference is probably whether you try to control the process - micro-intend the steps - or whether you let you attention flow across the determined path.

It's probably time to get back into details. Perhaps we could consider:

- If you are sat still just now, and then raise your arm. How do you conceive of that as happening? What is your description of that? *(And then how would you relate that to more "magickal" intentions - same? different?)*
- What would you say your most persistent fear as regards oneirosophy, from a conceptual point of view *or* a daily lived point of view? *(Which probably are the same thing, maybe?)*

  > Q2: Going somewhere isn't the point. I want to avoid the puddles. I can control each individual step then.

Hopefully puddle-avoidance would already be built in...

> Q2: Knowledge is different from pre-experiencing. For example, I know I can get to the store by walking in this and that way. I don't need to visualize the street. I just know.

You are *inferring* knowledge from the experience that arises. Which is potentially a different thing to "knowing", although we might say it is a part of *being* - a particular state.

> Q2: My point is, we're all doing it ... unless you want to tell me you experience no limitations whatsoever . . . You're not always teleporting. If you were always teleporting, you'd experience no limitation of any sort, ever.

You're conflating a couple of things here.

If *to-intend* is a reshaping of ourselves into another state, then that state is not necessarily radically different. However, *all* intending involves - *is* - a state change, a teleportation, we might say, from one configuration to another. However, the "formatting" of our state comes into play, as we've discussed before. If a particular fact or pattern is prominent in its contribution to experience, then it will continue to do so unless directly addressed, *or* another intention implies that it no longer applies, *or* we withdraw our participation with that pattern.

For as long as "the world is a spatially-extended place" is a dominant pattern, then intending "go to the shops" will tend to map out a experiential path of "walking there" rather than "appearing there". But the 'mechanism' is just the same: you don't "do" the walking, you intend the outcome "being at the shops" and that pattern is overlaid as fact, blended in with other patterning, and we have a corresponding sensory experience.

This what the patterning model is about: The only fundamental truth is that you are an awareness in a state. The state can be conceived of as consisting of relative intensities or contributions of fact-patterns. Intention changes the state and hence sensory experience. Nothing is ever "done".

You can piss about with "fear" and "expectation" all you want, but then you are just circling the direct nature of the thing.

> Q2: I explained the problem with the limited grid. It's just your imagination because it admits the problem I explained to you.

Hmm, not really. The grid is a configuration space pattern. It does not necessarily imply that every intention is a radical "frame-jump" - it simply says there is no inherent restriction in terms of triggering discontinuities in experience, and that each moment is fresh and disconnected from the previous one. It's actual use is to help

shift ourself out of the "world is a spatially-extended place unfolding in time" formatting, relatively speaking. *Because imagining something is intending is reformatting.*

> Q2: Not at all. There is more to it. It's got to do with one's expectations, fears, etc. So if one doesn't want to, or wants to, but feels fear, that's an interesting moment.

Those are very fluffy concepts. What is an expectation? What is a fear? Without addressing that, it's not an "interesting moment". It's a distraction from understanding. You can end up just implying their existence, persisting their ongoing influence in your life, if you don't have a larger context within which to place them. But really, the heart of it is this:

- If you wanted to make something true in your experience, how would you go about it?

There's nothing else really worth answering, in a way. It doesn't really matter what the particular "something" is. If that question can't be answered, then it's all just theatre, no power.

> Q2: You take frame A, where the world is spatially extended, and jump to frame Z, where the world is also spatially extended

The difficulty is, that while you conceive of the world as being a "place" and yourself as an object within that place, you are formatted against discontinuities. Not just "teleporting" - which I use as an example for discontinuity that's easier to grasp than other more general facts - but any shift that involves not having a stable substrate. Now, there's nothing special about metaphors like the "infinite grid". Like all structuring metaphors, they are simply useful for conceiving of a change, and for creating an apparent path for that change. It's a case of *imagining-that* something is true or possible, the better to get to our desired outcome, right? So let's not get hung up on content itself as being "really" true, which seems to be what's happening here.

> Q2: [Fear and Expectation] I can explain those, and I have, but you didn't engage.

Want to give it another whirl? Because you didn't explain them, as far as I could tell. What I'm reaching for is: if there is fear, to what extent is that something more than an occasional feeling? What else comes up? And then: does fear need to be tackled on a case by case basis, or can we just shift perspective and render it powerless. The *feeling* might still arise, perhaps, but the *meaning* would be transformed.

> Q2: I can explain that. It would be a very long explanations.

Why would it be long? Because it's hard to describe? Or because it's an involved process?

Surely the *basic idea* must be super-simple because, in effect, it's going to be all that ever "happens" - and it cannot be made from parts. (Which isn't to say that a particular experience of doing it can't utilise the idea of parts.)

> Q2: You're starting to understand the weakness of your grid model.

Ah, I see. This explains some confusion I've been having with what you've been saying. Actually, the infinite grid thing isn't my model for experience, it's just one way of conceptualising or formatting experience - one pattern overlay amongst many. The base model is "patterning", but of course *even that* is...

> Q2: is NOT the truth of what happens

It *can* be *a* truth - relative truth - of what happens, but it is not *the* truth, which is simply that we are *that-which-imagines-that* things are true and has corresponding experiences. The interesting thing is to find models or "active metaphors" which have useful aspects, and intend them into prominence, such that your experience unfolds "as if" they were true. In this way we make the paths more flexible - the more abstract formatting - rather than just intending outcomes and the path (the sequence of moments that arise) being "plausible" in that everyday way.

Of course, fundamentally we are just dreaming of being in a world with the properties that it seems to have, and there's nothing "behind' it. And this is why we get to ask ourselves: if we want to radically change the content of the dream, does it make sense to perform *dream actions* to do so, rather than dreaming the world differently? Dreaming of "doing something which will bring about that result" and dreaming of "things being true" are two approaches, but they are really the same approach. The first is format-bound, the second address the world-format issue directly.

> Q2: ... since it leaves out crucial info.

What is that crucial info? I think the only *crucial* info, is that we can directly experience ourselves as the formatted space in which experience arise - know it by recognising we are it. Without that understanding, everything else is wrong. It may be *self-consistently* correct, but it will be *fundamentally* wrong in a sense.

> Q2: Truly large fears are tacit. They're ever-present, but hidden from view.

Okay. How does this help you?

> Q2: I have to do introspection. It's serious business. As in, yea, I have to like pause what I am doing, stop typing and just be quiet for a moment and look inside.

Okay, so I'd say this is a simple process - in the sense that what one seems to do as context is straightforward - but also complex - in the sense that content tends to be very complex. (It reminds me of Eugene Gendlin's *A Process Model*, although I don't necessarily recommend wading thought that. It also doesn't go into "the world", more treats it as personal psychology, but it does provide a structured description of introspection.)

Of course, this is where we get into examples, but regardless of the specifics, I think we can still take the important step of not identifying with any particular content which we encounter. We also have to be careful that the concept of their being a "something" that is persistent and exportable is *itself* a patterning of experience. Whenever we intentionally go about the activity of "finding things out" or "changing things by interacting with them", we are also *implying* that such things exist, generating the corresponding experience. So it can get tricky, and that's once reason to explore direct assertion rather than interaction.

(Let's pick this up later. "Fear and process" seem like two interesting strands to discuss. I think our model-based exchanges have been based on a misunderstanding of what was being said.)

> [[Nefandi: I believe I understand the gist of your explanation very well and I find it useful and helpful, but I still have all the same issues with it as I mentioned in my last note to you. I consider what you're talking about to be, basically, the nuclear option. I like it. But I don't want to deploy a nuke against say a local ant infestation. So for me it can't be the end. I think small changes are sometimes better conceived in ways other than total frame jumps.

[For convenience, a "frame" is just any particular sensory arrangement. So it doesn't really make sense to say that a frame would be flexible internally - because that would be another frame.]; I understand. That's the model you like and I see merit in it, but I also see flaws in it. Your model assumes, for simplicity sake, that there is a static fixed moment, then a jump, then another static fixed moment, then a jump, and so on. I don't believe this is a truly accurate or final model of cognition. I think when I call the associated method of teleporting a nuclear option it should give you an idea of just how powerful and useful I think it is. So I believe even when I am not 100% satisfied with *only* this way of looking at cognition, it doesn't mean I don't appreciate it.

[There is no true model of reality.]; I agree. However, a teleportation intent does seem to assume certain things about experience. See above. It's not a problem per se, but it is what it is, as they say. I like the method. When I contemplate it I feel like I am becoming more fluid. All good. But I'm not going to make this the only thing I contemplate. I need smaller tools than nukes. I need lasers, scalpels, Bunsen burners, hand guns, bug sprays, miniguns, rockets, missiles, submarines, etc. I need an entire range of tools from micro to macro. Of course these are all metaphors. I'm talking about magick here.

[Really what one wants is to fully be the entirety of content and then shift-shape.]; I want to be capable of shift-shape, but I want to also be capable of localized change. I want to be able to create distortions. For example, I looked at my face in the mirror and focused. I got a nice visual distortion going where my head appeared huge. It was fun. Then I quickly saw the same head as normal sized. I like this. I didn't have to frame jump to do it. I was doing everything locally, leaving much of the context untouched. So I love what you're talking about. It's powerful. It does what you say it does. I agree. But I don't think I want to make that one contemplation be the beginning and end of all that I think about transformation, as powerful as it is.

[Stuff like "letting go" is just one way to relax the division and settle out into being the entire space and all that's within it. It's not letting go of control as such, it's letting go of (spatial) attentional focus and, counter-intuitively, becoming fully attended as a result.]; This sounds much more assertive to me. I like this way of saying it better, personally. I realize you're still saying the same thing, but to me these subtle aesthetic changes do matter. At least sometimes. And now is one of those times.

Also I feel that while your instruction is in many ways superlative, it also requires a high cost. Now I feel like I've paid maybe 80% of that cost, but I still feel like I don't 100% qualify to make full use of your teleport explanation because I still have some interfering hangups. OK, using a car metaphor, this thing is like an F1 car where the tiniest touch on the throttle means you fly at 300 MPH in 4 seconds. My reaction time is not there yet to handle that much power. This is only a metaphor. I mean, I understand what you're saying, but to *really* make use of it is something where I have to go slow. But how do I go slow with this, essentially nuclear option? This approach attains a total change of everything at all times. I still don't think of it like that. I still think that a total change is my capability but not something I always do or want to do. This is

> limiting. I realize that, but I have to be honest about my limitations. In some ways I am not exactly proud of this. Thank you for your response.]]

Good points, these, particularly about how to view the apparent nuke option. Will reply when back at a desk this afternoon.

[...]

We hit the limits of language and metaphor here, because "intending" isn't a thing or an act, since that implies a doer and a thing done. But that's never stopped me typing away before, and it won't stop me now...

Intending vs Sensory Theatre

Firstly, you should view all of your sensory experiencing as a *result*. No part of a sensory experience causes another part of a sensory experience. If you feel yourself moving your arm - maybe a verbal thought then a muscle tension then an arm movement - you need to recognise that *all* of that was a result, and none of it was the intention.

- *Intending has no sensory aspect.*
- *If you experience a sensory outcome, it is arising as an implication of the intending.*
- *You cannot experience yourself intending as such.*

"Intending" can be viewed as you *changing your state* - where "state" means the current distribution of patterns and facts that constitute your world, dissolved into the background of your experience. One way to think of this, is as a landscape whose contours are the facts and patterns. Your ongoing sensory experience then arises, like a mirage, from this landscape. You cannot change the mirage itself, all change is indirect. You change your landscape-state, and subsequently all your experiences will be aligned with that state.

- *Your state is the 'cause' of all your experiences.*
- *It consists of all possible facts and patterns, at relative strengths of contribution. It therefore implicitly defines the sequence of moments that are queued up into the future.*
- *All change is indirect and is a change of state, a change of the relative prominence of certain facts and patterns, a redistribution of the landscape. "Intending" is what we call changing state.*

"An intention", then, is what we call the pattern which we are going to emphasise in our state. It is like an unbounded non-sensory thought, a dimensionless fact. Emphasising such a fact involves a literal and direct reshaping of this 'landscape'. Basically, a reshaping of ourselves. But wait - if we only sensorily experience something when intending if the intention affects the part of the landscape we are currently "looking at", how do we loop this back to direct experience?

Mostly: faith. But for the purposes of exploration, we cheat. Although we can direct without any sensory theatre, it is easier initially to use misdirection and create an experience of doing *something*, but have that "doing" not interfere with what we are trying to accomplish.

Back to the Chair

When people get up from a chair, they typically use misdirection by intending muscular tension (an experience of "doing") and during that the intention of standing up occurs. But in this case the misdirection and the desired outcome are opposing one another. Instead, let's have our experience of "doing" be independent. We sit in the chair, and we place our attention on the background space of the room, and we decide that by focusing on the background space of the room, our body is going to stand up. Rather than intending that "tensing my muscles *means-that* I will stand up", we are intending that "focusing on the background space of the room *means-that* I will stand up".

Of course, one could simply non-sensorily intend the fact that "I will stand up" (the *"just-decide"* approach), but actually the *"assignment of meaning (or causal power)"* approach gives you a good experience of a general principle. That is, that intention is always the true cause even though it cannot be sense.

Once you've played with the background space example, you can try "looking out the window *means-that* I will stand up". Then, "saying 'stand up' *means-that* I will stand up". And penultimately, "being here in this position right now *means-that* I will stand up". After that, you are at raw intention, and are in a position to extrapolate your new understanding of causality to your experience of the world more generally.

> A1: Was that a sort of intending that I was doing or was the energy already there being unleashed from the awakening I was going through and I was just overlaying unnecessary imaginations on top of something that was already happening anyway?

I'd say that you were *imagining-that* something was true with conviction, and your ongoing experience was patterned accordingly. There was no energy "out there" but it is enough that you have an *idea* of "energy" and imagine yourself accessing it. You committed to your own logic, and everything else followed. In terms of the parent comment, you were "intending" a situation as true by implication, and then experiencing it. (You could have directly asserted what you wanted without any of that "sensory theatre", however it's much easier to allow something to happen if you think that it "makes sense" somehow.)

What your awakening did, was free you up from your habitual patterns, crack you open. and make things more fluid in terms of what could be asserted or implied. Although, as you notice, you can make yourself quite unstructured quite quickly if you're not careful - basically, put yourself into a manic mode!

>A1: For some reason the idea of there not being any challenge at all seemed to take the fun out of things.

Indeed. So you can directly assert something by simply *just-deciding* that it is true. This amounts to assigning fresh meaning to the current experience: "my current situation *means-that* this is true", which is equivalent to "my existence *means-that* this is true". All perhaps without any sensory aspect to it at all.

But as you've noted: where's the fun in that? Because where that would end up if we pursued this fully, is with a completely disconnected experience, just like everyday casual associative thinking or just random hypnagogic imagery. Getting bored, we would once again allow that imagery to coalesce into a scene and then an environment, just like the beginning of a dream, and we'd be in a world again. *Although this time we know its nature.*

Understanding this, we can skip that process.

So, overall, once we have the idea that the only causal power is ourselves as intentional state-shifters, this frees us from our limited concepts. Strangely, one of the benefits of the realisation is that we no longer have to burrow down to the fundamentals, because we've recast all experience and so can be high level again - while retaining our updated perspective. Basically, be more playful, treating ourselves and the world within us as "all imagination" and all imaginings as facts at different relative levels of intensity or contribution.

> >A1: [Strangely, one of the benefits of the realisation is that we no longer have to burrow down to the fundamentals, because we've recast all experience and so can be high level again - while retaining our updated perspective. Basically, be more playful, treating ourselves and the world within us as "all imagination" and all imaginings as facts at different relative levels of intensity or contribution.]; Totally, this is where things start to get really fun, I think. With that said, have you noticed that things seem to unfold in more novel and amusing ways than the way in which you initially imagined them, or even could have imagined them at the time?

The world, it seems, does have a bit of a wit about it, it's true!

[...]

> > Q: Question about oneness?: If everything is an embodiment of myself, are others real? Like are other people are just fragments of me
>
> > 7kek7: My experience is that **others ARE actually a fragment of my consciousness. Literally just a reflection of my thoughts and expectations.**

Reply to “New here, and I have a question.”

All experiences occur inside 'experiencing'. Even ideas about an "outside" of experiencing, occur inside of 'experiencing'.

We can fantasise all we want about what is going on "out there", but it will still just be a concept "in here" - with "in here" also being a concept. You never experience inside *or* outside really. All we ever encounter is our own mind, taking on the shape of a particular state, from which experiences apparently arise. In fact, you can easily demonstrate to yourself there is no outside - by trying to find it, right now!

Hint: First direct your attention towards "the place you are looking out from" as you read these words right now. Continue onwards as far as you can, see if you can find a boundary. Now do the same in all directions. Now try and find where "you" are. If you think you find yourself, ask why you are able to see yourself, from the outside. Realise that this means you are the outside too, which is therefore *also* inside.

> [Q: Yes, i see what you mean. I guess what I'm arguing doesn't have any impact on my own experience as I will never know one way or the other. I just saw in the description of the subreddit that "Objectivity and materialism are not logically coherent" and I think that materialism can make sense if it gives rise to subjective consciousness, which cannot tell how it was created.
>
> Also what do you think of this: Objectivity is only possible inside of our own minds. For example if Earth's entire biosphere was a simulation run by a superintelligent AI (which it might be) then that AI by necessity would be omnipresent and perfectly understand everything that was happening inside this simulation/dream it was having. As a result the AI would be able to determine objective truths about the system because it perfectly understood the system.
>
> Not sure how logical that is.]

"Materialism" is a conceptual framework, which arises subjectively in people's minds. "Materialism" is *made from* thoughts and is nothing other than that. It's a potentially useful way of thinking; it might lead to interesting ideas for creativity and behaviour, for instance. But it cannot "give rise to subjective consciousness", because it is itself dependent upon it.

For your example - You are already in that position, of being "objective inside of your own mind". So, in what sense do you know everything or perfectly understand the system of your own mind? You'll notice: All you ever come to appreciate is *relative truth* within the *content* of your experiences. And it doesn't matter at what scale this operates at. This is separate from the *nature* of experiencing, which is *fundamental* (unchanging) truth.

So a way to get to the heart of it, right now, is to realise that the *nature* of your experience remains the same regardless of its *content*, and that since content amounts to patterns within the mind, it makes no sense to talk of the mind *arising* from content.

To reuse a metaphor: If your mind was a blanket of material, and the folds within the blanket were the content of your experience, is there any arrangement of folds which could fully capture the truth of the existence of the blanket?

Reply to “A question about tables”

> [OP: Exactly what do you guys think regarding the-material in (your) "waking" reality (tables, in this example):
>
> A) There is a table that exists independently of subjective perceptions, but all you know of it IS those subjective perceptions. Your goal is to play with those perceptions as much as you can.
>
> B) There no table at all in any dimension that is outside yourself.
>
> C) Other?]

I suppose we would have to start by tackling what we mean by "yourself", "outside" and "tables". Basically, we have to begin by discussing the *nature of experiencing* itself. Eventually, we'd get to something like: what "you" are, is subjectivity; there is no outside to subjectivity; all possible forms can be thought of as being "dissolved" within subjectivity like patterns at different relative intensities of contribution; a perception of the table *is* the table, or rather a direct sensory aspect of it; there is no need for an independent "feed" and in fact this would be nonsensical; our subjectivity "takes on the shape of" states and experiences and is not separate from them.

Furthermore, we would have to address the possibility that the *world-as-it-is* is not necessarily of the same "format" as sensory experience - in other words, it is not a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time". Spatial extension and context, and change, are aspects of experiences rather than aspects of the world *as such*. Only "experiencing" happens; the world does not "happen". And so on.

There is no contradiction, I suggest.

> >OP: The first two parts imply that our purely-subjective sense-inputs are...

In your reading of the first two statements, you have *presumed* such a thing as "sense inputs". The notion of "inputs" of course implies an external world - but that is begging the question. In your current experience of this moment, can you identify any "sensory inputs"?

> >OP: The most consistent explanation would be that there is some external "it"... Though how exactly that happens is subjective, yes.

If there *were* an external "it" - what would it be external *to*? And could we ever ascertain whether something was being caused by an external "it" versus that something arising purely internally? Do we ever in fact experience anything external, other than as a thought *about* something being external (a thought which of course arises *internally*)?

An additional line of questioning would focus on what the "stuff" of the external would be made from. In order to interact with the internal, would it not have to be made of the same "stuff" as the internal?

I suggest that we aren't dealing with "sensory inputs" here; there is no "outside" to experiencing.

I also suggest that it's vital that we note the difference between *attending to* our experience and *thinking about* our experience. It is very easy to build "castles in the sky" which are self-consistent and so "make sense" when we think of them, but in fact do not correspond to the structure of our ongoing moment as it is experienced. These "parallel constructions in thought" have an inherent problem: they arise *within* experience and so cannot capture experience.

It's like trying to build a sandcastle which accurately models both "the whole beach" and also "sand". If one is not careful, one ends up making a partial duplicate of another sandcastle and *calling* it "the beach" or "sand", when it is neither (but also, somewhat ironically, both).

> OP: I think believing you are everything you experience is nonsensical.

It is not a belief. It is, finally, a direct observation, from which follows a self-consistent description. Whether that description seems nonsensical or not, depends on that platform from which you think about it. For starters, as I indicated in my first response, it matters somewhat what you consider to be "you". The thinking that occurs within one "castle" does not necessarily translate - often cannot be translated to - the thinking which occurs in another. They are, however, self-consistent within their own perspective.

In the end, then, the reason to go for "B" is that direct observation does not in fact support "A". Never having observed an external world, and discovering no edges to one's experience, the only possible conclusion is that the world is entirely *within* experience, which is you, and is entirely *made from* experience, which is also you. A coherent description can then be built - in fact, *many* can be built - from that starting point, each with their benefits as *relative* truth, while only the observable nature of experiencing itself is held as the *fundamental* truth. [1]

Aside: There's not much point in quoting stretches of philosophical writings. What matters is how you are bringing their insights - or rather, your interpretation of their insights - to bear on the discussion you are having. I can copy-paste you a whole load of Kant if you like, but I don't see how that furthers a discussion?

[1] Please note that kicking a stone is no refutation.

> **[57. Refutation of Bishop Berkeley**
>
> After we came out of the church, we stood talking for some time together of Bishop Berkeley's ingenious sophistry to prove the nonexistence of matter, and that every thing in the universe is merely ideal. I observed, that though we are satisfied his doctrine is not true, it is impossible to refute it. I never shall forget the alacrity with which Johnson answered, striking his foot with mighty force against a large stone, till he rebounded from it -- "I refute it thus."]
>
> > OP: Don't be silly.

That's not very helpful. My point was that just quoting doesn't engage the points raised, as they were raised and in the context they were raised. It's not a discussion. My "kicking a stone" comment was fairly obviously a gently playful allusion to that. No spaghetti monsters involved.

> OP: Subjective interpretation is indeed undeniable.

Do you not mean to say that *subjective experience* is undeniable?

> OP: What you are interpreting is most simply explained by the external.

I don't think it is. Now, *you* may have an "instinctual belief" in an external world, but many do not, after attending directly to their experience, and find reason to question it. And I don't agree that an "instinctual belief" in something is, of itself, any reason to refrain from exploring parallel constructions.

No justification at all is required to do so, other than curiosity. Beyond that, the benefits of a parallel construction will likely only become apparent after it has been constructed.

> OP: "can never be any reason for rejecting one instinctive belief except that it clashes with others"

I would disagree. See above. There is no reason at all to commit to a single view - besides lack of interest or curiosity. In fact, the recognition of an instinctual belief may *itself* be the motivation for putting it aside and seeking alternatives. You realise it's just a "castle in the sky", suggesting there are other such "castles" to be constructed and explored.

You seem to be implying that an alternative construction, based around a purely subjective view, could not allow for "a harmonious, complex system..."? Why do you think that? (Of course, a "purely subjective view" isn't a subjective view at all, since there is no subjective/objective dichotomy. There is just "the context of experience".)

Reply to “Lucid Dreaming Question Which Pertains To Reality”

Basically, the only "correct" or *fundamental* truth is that "there is an experience that is being experienced" - made up from sensations, perceptions and thoughts (which are really of the same nature: "awareness"). This is the *context* of experience. Beyond that, all *content* of experience is *relatively* true only.

There is no "how things really are" behind the scenes; there is no "how things work". In fact, there is no "behind the scenes". What there is, in effect, is experiential patterns within your subjective perspective. And since it is *you-as-awareness* that "takes on the shape of" these patterns, then by shifting your own shape you shift the formatting of your experience.

So that's probably the two main truths, really the only ones and the same one actually:

- The "nature of experiencing", which corresponds to the true nature of "you" - *context*;
- The implications of this for the structuring of your experience, and how it can be re-patterned or reformatted - *content*.

If we conceive of the latter as amounting to a set of "facts" corresponding to the sum of all intentions so far (and their implications), then we have a better idea of how to think about "lucid dreaming" and "how it operates".

Reply to “How to start? Or maybe not.”

> Q: Oneirosophy is less of a concrete path and more a topic of study.

Quite so. And as you point out, the reading list is intended to *raise questions* - it simply points out possible texts for contemplation across a range of areas - rather than provide answers.

Reply to “[Question] Using imagination”

> >OP: *"You are limited by your uncontrolled imagination and lack of attention to the feeling of your wish fulfilled. When imagination is not controlled and the attention not steadied on the feeling of wish fulfilled, then no amount of prayer or piety or invocation will produce the desired effect."*
>
> Could someone explain to me the practical way to utilize what's said above by Goddard? What I mean...like how often and for what durations does my imagination need to be steadied onto wish fulfilled? Does it have to be literally every single moment?

You don't have to maintain it once you've achieved it, because it'll stick. Think of it like a one-off amendment to a painting - the painting is your world. You want to change one aspect of it, but if you don't hold you brush steady, really pay attention to the part you want to modify, and feel the contact, bring it to life, you won't succeed in making the update. When you've made the change, you can *see-feel* it; you know you've done it. And you don't need to keep re-making it. When he talks of "feeling of your wish fulfilled", he means imagining it (from the 1st person) until you get that feeling of it **being true already**. That's when you know the painting has been modified and the changes have stuck.

> [A: *“What I mean...like how often and for what durations does my imagination need to be steadied onto wish fulfilled? Does it have to be literally every single moment?”*; **That's up to you.** If it feels like it's not up to you, then it will take literally forever. It will take an infinite amount of time and effort.
>
> But if you feel like it's up to you, if you genuinely believe that it's up to you, then it'll take as long as you decide it takes. I know that seems like a cryptic thing to say, but it's the only way I can answer your question in a way that's not going to mislead you.]

[...]

> > Q: How Do I Start Molding My Reality Through My Awareness. What exactly needs to be changed perspectice wise and how do I go about it.
>
> [7kek7: **You already do it, you just haven't realized it.**]

[...]

[Replies to OP - Life not feeling real.]

> > A: Please try cloudbursting. Look at the sky for a few small clouds in a group. Do not tell anyone. Then pick a cloud that you want to disappear. It will. This and other reality-bending experiments will prove to you that **your mind is** connected to, or maybe **the same as**, **reality itself**.
>
> > Q: cam you make clouds grow darker? Well over time

[[DreamerAxelos: You can do whatever you want! Everything is part of your dream, so you alone have control. However, some things may seem from your perspective to be more difficult, at least at first. That's why I suggest beginning with making clouds disappear first. It's easier for your mind to accept. Once you have experience with making clouds disappear, you can move on to making them grow, move, appear, darken, lighten, etc.]]

Reply to “Is theorizing even useful?”

Theory is fun, but I do think its value is either in the straightforward enjoyment of mental creativity, or for coming up with ideas for new experiences and intentions. Problems only arise when we confuse the theory with "how things really are" rather than patterns which can be used to intend experiences "as if" that is how things really are. It is important, I'd say, to realise that theorising is *just another experience*; it isn't any "deeper" or more fundamental than any other experience; theorising doesn't get "behind" anything.

In other words, theories don't actually capture anything. They are parallel constructions in experience which can also be brought into the main experience, via intention - but you can never capture the "nature of experiencing" in a theory. That is like trying to build a sandcastle which captures both "the beach" and "sand". The sandcastle *is* both of those things, but it cannot *encapsulate* either of them. The best it can do is indirectly point you towards attending to the beach context that surrounds the castle's content.

See related comment on descriptions and theories as potential prisons:

> Q1: It's curious how language has become a type of prison in a way.

I'd broaden this, even, to say that *descriptions* have become a type of a prison - because, particularly recently, people have come to view descriptions as being accurate depictions of the world, even seeing them as *the world itself*, rather than "parallel constructions in thought" that are basically catalogues of (a subset of) observations to date.

Where this gets tricky that, although descriptions *themselves* do not limit the possibilities of what might be observed because they are non-causal (apart from some mild patterning side-effects), intentions *are* causal - and so intentions *based on* those descriptions tend to *imply* those descriptions as their extended patterns.

For example: there may be no evil sprits as such, but if you start intending your route to the shops based on avoidance of spirit attack, your state will shift somewhat towards experiences "as if" there are such things, even though you have not specifically intended the "evil spirit world-description" as being true.

Since "intentions" are just "patterns you are intensifying into prominence" in order to reshape experience, those can be outcomes, facts, or something more like "formatting" (basic descriptions of how the world works). That's why metaphors are so useful, and that's where the idea of "active metaphors" comes from.

If you formulated your outcome in terms of a "solid spatial world", then intending that will imply that worldview - *intend* that worldview - along with the outcome. If you formulate it in terms of an "infinite grid of parallel moments", then you'll be implying *that* worldview instead, and will find your overall experience tends to shift towards it.

So you can, of course, simply *intend the worldview* instead to make a more general change. (Easy to test: Just go around for a couple of days intending that "life is a dream" and you'll quickly find that... *it is*. Then switch "life is a material world" and you'll get that happening instead.)

Your description, then, is one such "active metaphor" and you will tend to have experiences consist with that if you use it directly or implicitly. However, there is no *fundamental* "how things are" at all; which is why "seeking for knowledge" is an endless and pointless task. There's only one thing to understand, and that's something you do by *noticing* rather than working it out.

> Q2: so fundamental formatting of the universe is also an intention

To slightly rephrase, just because "universe" is a bit of a messy concept: the formatting of *awareness* is the accumulation of intended patterns and their implications so far. And: since all intentions have a *meaning*, which is their extended pattern context, then *to intend* always implies the worldview of which that intention is a part, just as you say.

> Q2: so what i notice becomes reality, but what i notice is reality

...since there's no separation between "noticing" and "reality". Which is why it can perhaps be better to phrase things as simply "experiences", because that removes the notions of an action, an actor, and an independent object. Instead, we have "experiencing" which "shifts (itself)" to take on the shape of states or experiences.

Reply to “Morning Lucidity (new lucidity technique)”

> [OP: So this morning after having a ton of weird dreams from unregular sleep i had some insight into a new lucidity technique. When i woke up this morning i was super groggy and slept in much longer then i usually do, yet when i was lying in bed still awake, it kind of still felt like i was dreaming because i was so out of it.
>
> The morning seems to be a good time to work on lucidity insight mainly because you have just been dreaming and its fresh on your mind. So this technique for lucidity is rather simple. The second you wake up in the morning instead of telling yourself you woke up, you instead try to feel that this is yet another dream in the sequence. The closer you can do this upon the ending of the dream the more effective it should be. It would probably be most effective if its after a particularly vivid and memorable dream as well.]
>
> > OP: this technique is used to make waking reality seem more dream like, not to induce a lucid dream just to make that clear
>
> > Q1: Is there a difference? This is one thing I've been wondering about for a while. I've had a number of experiences that lead me to suspect that waking reality is really just a lucid dream where we are dreaming that we're not dreaming.
>
> So there's a threshold of disbelief that, once breached, makes it obvious one is in a lucid dream and so one then treats reality as such and if shit gets weird one just wakes up in bed. But if on the other hand one wakes up into a lucid dream and nothing is weird, the belief tends to be, "ah this is waking reality" and so it is treated as such.
>
> Is the point you're getting at with making waking reality more dreamlike vs inducing a full-on lucid dream one of stability so as to not wake up from the dream? I'm not sure if I'm following.

I think what he is getting at is simply using that moment upon waking to assert to oneself that the day that is about to commence is no different in essential quality to a dream (contrary to one's usual assumptions); to bring the "sense of dream" you still have upon waking on, into the day with you.

It is true there is no difference in type between waking and dreaming, but we do not normally act as though that is the case, even if we recognise it intellectually. I think his exercise is a suggestion for bringing it over, *as a feeling*, into actual experience via intervention.

(I'm reminded that Tenzin Wangyal Rinpoche's *The Tibetan Yogas Of Dream And Sleep*, on our reading list, has a similar idea where you assert that "this is a dream" throughout the day, and ongoing experience starts to fall into line with that assertion over time, such that it is *sensed* to be a dream.)

> >Q1: Ah ok. Yeah I've done some practice with reminding myself, "This is a dream" throughout the day, but without that felt sense, it's not very effective. This is a pretty good idea the more I think about it. Setting that intention to do it right away in the morning would be pretty powerful.
>
> Back to the felt sense, does one need to have to felt sense in order to experience waking reality as a dream or can one come from a place of not having that felt sense and start acting as-if anyway in order to obtain the feeling?

So, of course it's always true anyway, regardless of the feeling you have. The feeling is, after all, just another experience. Reality is *always* a waking dream, even when it's a waking dream of "feeling that this is a world based on a solid persistent substrate". This means that the power of direct intention is always available to you (because of course that's how the whole thing came about anyway, and it's how you are moving your arms and legs right now). Therefore, if you *do* want to generate the feeling, then you can *just-decide* it directly - *or* you could intend something else that *implies-that* you have the feeling, as part of its larger pattern. As you say, performing acts which correspond to a dreamlike reality, thereby triggering the extended "life is dreamlike" pattern, would be one way to go about that.

Again, though, you can just "know" it without having the feeling, but I do agree that having the feeling within experience means you have a constant reminder, or presence, which can prevent you getting lost in the dream-as-solid-reality again.

> >Q2: it even makes sense if you logically think about it - thinking about reality can be condensed into one thought strand and set about as a construct upon itself or within others
>
> but then what makes that so? is it you? is it every poster on reddit or the people on the street or the Jews or the government? it has to be me and there are hard limits on others on what they can do
>
> even if their souls are unaffected, their actions are limited - otherwise I would not be able to accomplish anything except at the behest of others' desires: I would have to follow all laws of whoever is in government, I would be subject to arrest for any number of things I do or say, and their religions/beliefs would tower over mine.

Strands which are thoughts *about* the world, are basically parallel worlds all on their own. T**here is only you, so you don't need to concern yourself about the limitations of others.** However, this is *you-as-awareness* rather than *you-as-person*. There are in, fact, *no* "worlds" or "people" at all in the sense that we usually conceive of them - as external and independent objects and beings that are "happening". Rather, they are *patterns in awareness*, and *you-as-awareness* is the only thing that is ever "happening". There are no soul**s** beyond the concept "souls".

> >Q2: right, or parallel universes

Yes. So - when I say "world", I don't mean it in the sense of "planet". I mean it as a "self-consistent coherent realm or pattern" or something like that. We could equally use "reality" or "universe", depending on the associations of those terms for our target audience. What we *don't* mean, though, is something like a "place".

> >Q2: then who is another? i mean, there must be other existences of others not-perceptible within any universe

What "another"? Have you ever encountered "another"? And what does it mean to talk about something which is "not-perceptible". If you are talking about something, then it *is* perceivable in *some form* - even if that's in the form of an *idea*. Which loops back to what were were saying previously: aren't *ideas* basically patterns and worlds, and those "just" *ideas*?

> >Q2: then couldn't i have the idea of another existing in a separate place - i.e. an entirely different being separate to every universe that could exist within the range of my all-possible universes

You could. But that would just be an idea in your current moment of awareness. It would be a thought "about" something; it says nothing of its actually happening other than it is happening in thought, now.

> >Q2: who is the actor in, say, my parents? even if all bodies are controlled by me , the experiencer could be different

Hmm. What "experiencer"? Pause now, and try to find boundaries or multiplicity in awareness. Try to find an experiencer. Where is it? There is *not even* one experiencer; there is just "experiencing". It makes no sense to talk of multiple experiencers - or experiences. Even the idea of "other experiencers" is... an experience, one of them, now. Are you "in" you? Are you an actor "in" you? If you are thinking of answering yes, pause more, and try and identify where it is. Now, consider again what it means to talk of an actor "in" your parents.

There are no actors, I suggest. **Nothing is happening, except this experience, now.**

> >Q2: but that is a thought about me

How can you have a thought "about" you? What does that mean? Is any thought *actually* about you (in the sense of capturing what you are about)?

> >Q2: but could i not 'let' another have an experience within my experience?

What other? There aren't any others. Strictly speaking, it's not "my" experience; it's just experience. "My" is *itself* an experience.

No thought can capture the medium within which it resides and of which it is constructed, surely? You can't think about the *actual* you; you can only think *other* stuff and *call it*, incorrectly, "you". Direct investigation reveals that experience has no boundary, and hence no "outside". Any idea you have *about* an outside, is just a thought of the *idea* of an outside – inside. Who says that *people* are liberated? I suggest that people can't be liberated, because there are no people. However, "that which has and is experiences" can shape-shift such that it is no longer under the illusion that *is* a particular shape (in this case, the shape of apparently *being-a-person-in-a-world*).

In what sense does there have to be a "purpose" to experiences? The idea of "purpose" is *itself* an experience - of thinking about the concept "purpose".

Experiences - in fact *just-being* - is its own reason. That isn't necessarily the same as a *logical* reason, though. It is important not to conflate *thinking* (e.g. mulling over *concepts* about life and experience, and ideas such as "reasons" and "purpose") with the main strand of experience.

Thinking about "a purpose" is an experience. A "sense of purpose" is itself just another experience. You might as well ask, "what is the purpose in having a sense of purpose?", and so on. You can do that, but none of those answers will matter in the slightest really; they are parallel, and say nothing about the fundamental situation.

If you need something to hold onto, though, one might say that the reason to experience anything is simply the feeling of wanting to. Any unpacked, narrative reason is just arbitrary story-making to justify that feeling, or desire.

> > Q2: isn't that a reason? the reason to be is to be

Yes, but with a small caveat. The difficulty is, the "reason" that can be described isn't the actual reason. "Logical" reasons and "direct" reasons both appear identically in written language - and so the two get confused. It's another aspect of that thing where, when you discuss "the nature of experience" most people immediately switch their attention onto some *thinking-about experience* in order to explore it, rather than attending to *actual experience*. Often, discussion don't emphasise the difference, and so people talk at cross purposes. Not us, though, eh? :-)

Well, you do have experiences involving "another" one one level - it's just that *you-as-awareness* are "taking on the shape" of the experience of being *this-person* interacting with *that-person*. They are both *what-you-truly-are*, but since that "you" is not a *personal* you - and is undivided and therefore not really an object at all - then it doesn't devalue the interaction. As with the whole solipsism thing, the error arises with from the fact that all thinking presupposes division - objects and relationships in mental space - and assumes that experiences is of that nature also, when it is sort of neither that *nor* not that.

> Q2: i'm just fed up with the running-around-in-circles!

Just give up thinking about it, is what it comes down to eventually. You can't "solve" this in thought anyway, because it's not a "problem". Only the *concept* of it is. The only way to have an experience of something being a certain way, is to start viewing it that way. Things are no way in particular, inherently. That's why you can't work it out. However, as you indicate, you *can* have an "insight" - an intuitive direct knowing - that things are a certain way fundamentally (that is, undivided and unchanging and containing all possibilities and all *you-as-awareness*). You can never reach this by thinking about it though, or by performing actions to get to it, because those thoughts and actions already imply division; that is enfolded in the intention. All you can do, is bear in mind that it is *always true* that, whether you are experiencing division and location or blending and expansion, you are an undivided *that* which is "taking on the shape of" the experience of apparent division, or apparent expansion, and so on.

> Q2: then how did i have those "insights"? if i could just have that insight perpetually - is what i'm striving for

There isn't a "how" as such, but I'd suggest it's when you cease holding onto your attentional focus, cease subtly constraining and deforming experience. When people do relaxation or contemplation or releasing, while they might "let go of" their body movements and thoughts, letting them be, they often still hold onto their attentional focus - in spatial or content terms - perhaps just very slightly. This can be likened to allowing a piece of material to relax into a loose state, while still holding onto the edges. For sure, you not shaping *the content* as such, but you are still holding it in an overall state which is a deformation of its unmodified state.

So - you might have let go of 3-dimensional sensory content, but you are still holding onto the experience of *3-dimensional space itself*, which prevents you having that direct intuition or knowing of the void "everything everywhere all at once in every location" truth.

> Q1: But are there not infinitely many perspectives of this experience, now? How is one able to assume that what is being experienced from one perspective applies to all other perspectives?

There are infinitely many *possible experiences*, but that doesn't mean that there are infinitely many experiences that are "happening". You might say that all possible experiences are "enfolded" or "dissolved" into awareness, but only one is "unfolded" or "condensed/expanded" into sensory experiences, now. Or you could think of it

as having a book in your hand with 100 pages "enfolded" into it, but only one page is current unfolded as the experience of "reading". In other words, the world is basically static and eternal, and the only thing that is "happening" is the current experience of it within, and as, "awareness".

Although it's tempting to imagine that there are many perspectives or "awarenesses" that are happening at once, this is incorrect - because awareness is not an object, and has no boundary; there is no outside to it. It is not "*an* awareness" it is just "awareness", which you might conceive of as a sort of "material whose only inherent property is *being-aware* and which takes on the shape of experiential states". Furthermore, not being an object, it does not exist within time - rather, apparent change is something which is part of an experiential state. So it is meaningless to talk of "awareness**es**" or experiences happening at "the same time"; spatial-extent and passage of time are part of an experience, not part of awareness. This also means that you are not a person, as such. The current "shape" or state *you-as-awareness* has taken on, then, is that of apparently *being-a-world-from-the-perspective-of-a-person*.

> Q1: To take what you're saying literally seems to imply that what I'm witnessing is not two people having a conversation on the internet via the use of human bodies but rather just my own mind communicating with itself with no existence of said bodies on computers somewhere else.

It's tricky to talk about because the "I'm" you refer to isn't *you-as-person* and when we say "witnessing" we have to be careful we don't imply that there is some sort of separation - this isn't a situation whereby there is an observer and then a thing that is being observed. In your current moment right now, you can easily notice that although you are having an experience of *apparently* "being over here with the screen over there", in fact when you go looking for yourself you discover you are sort of "everywhere". (This is best done with eyes closed: attend to your body sensations, then attend to distant sounds, and try to identify where "you" are - in particular, try and find the "edges" to your experience.) In fact, you'll discover you don't really have a human body at all *as such*. So, it's not a case of "my own mind communicating with itself": there is no communication happening; there's a sensory experience "as if" two people were talking. Fundamentally, though, there *are no people* as we usually conceive of it. There's just a particular total pattern in awareness = a state.

Now, written down like this, that sounds quite start and lonely, but that's where we return to our early points: awareness isn't a "thing" and also it isn't made from anything; it is undivided. This means that the entire situation is always one of fundamental "aliveness" and "oneness". Therefore, *you-as-awareness* is in fact the total aliveness of the world, taking on the shape of anything - albeit not in the way you might have originally thought. That is, the world is more like a dissolved pattern than it is a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time". However, that does not make it less "real" or "existing".

In fact, it makes it *more* real than you might have thought, because it means that the world is more than the basic model you might have confused it with. What you had previously considered to be "real people" and a "real world" are, upon inspection, just some thoughts you were having *about* the world - inferior, empty concepts, parallel constructions lacking in complexity and momentum. The *world-as-it-is*, although of the same nature (patterns in awareness), is so much more than that; it is *everything, always*. Hence, perhaps, "the world in a grain of sand".

> Q1: This I can grok. I visualize it similar to a Mandelbrot set zoom. All of the patterns inherently exist as potential but only one particular pattern is in frame at any given time.

Right, that's one way to imagine it. I've used things like an infinite grid, or an origami fortune teller or an ink droplet analogy in the past.

> [**Ink droplet analogy**
>
> Bohm also used the term *unfoldment* to characterise processes in which the explicate order becomes relevant (or "relevated"). Bohm likens unfoldment also to the decoding of a television signal to produce a sensible image on a screen. The signal, screen, and television electronics in this analogy represent the implicate order, while the image produced represents the explicate order. He also uses an example in which an ink droplet can be introduced into a highly viscous substance (such as glycerine), and the substance rotated very slowly, such that there is negligible diffusion of the substance. In this example, the droplet becomes a thread, which in turn eventually becomes invisible. However, by rotating the substance in the reverse direction, the droplet can essentially reform. When it is invisible, according to Bohm, the order of the ink droplet as a pattern can be said to be *implicate* within the substance.
>
> In another analogy, Bohm asks us to consider a pattern produced by making small cuts in a folded piece of paper and then, literally, unfolding it. Widely separated elements of the pattern are, in actuality, produced by the same original cut in the folded piece of paper. Here, the cuts in the folded paper represent the implicate order, and the unfolded pattern represents the explicate order.]

Basically, any metaphor that conveys the idea that the entirety of all possible states exists eternally "dissolved" into the background, and that from that a state is selected and a sensory experience is unfolded - but all of the same "stuff", that is "awareness". What's important is, not to confuse these descriptions with "what is really happening", because even those descriptions are *themselves* just more experience - and all that is every "really happening" is this exact experience, now.

> > Q1: Does "awareness" and "consciousness" point to the same place for you or are they different in the way you use them?

They're both rather corrupted words, I'd say. The problem with "consciousness" is that it's now used in at least three distinct ways, and those ways are conflated such that the meaning in this context can get obscured. The three ways are: "consciousness-of" (that is, the content of consciousness), "self-consciousness" (the identification with one part of that content as "me") and "consciousness" (that is, the "stuff" of experience). Here, we mean something like the final definition. I think that using the word "awareness" can be a bit better because, although it's often used to mean "the thing we have our spatial attentional focus on", it is vague enough to fit our intended meaning of "the 'material' whose only property is *being-aware* and which 'takes on the shape of' states and experiences".

> > Q1: The way I've been picturing it lately is as if "The One" has all these countless fingers of awareness that it started diving into this static Mandelbrot-like hologram with.

That's fine as far as it goes, but you are still subtly distinguishing between a thing that is aware ("The One"), and the thing it is aware of ("this static... hologram"). We really want our metaphor to convey that there is "that", and "that" is adopts the shape of experiences - and that experiences actually consist of all possibilities at once, just with some possibilities being "brighter" than others, hence "take on the shape of". All of which is a

battle to avoid accidentally talking about "that" as if it is an object, as a result of language only being able to deal things in terms of objects.

> Q1: Which seems to imply that there's no way to know whether any of the other people in my experience have any awareness behind their experience or if I'm just looking at empty images and assuming they do.

Well, if you follow the above reasoning, the question doesn't even arise. There is nothing "behind" anything; there is no awareness "behind" experience, because awareness is what "takes on the shape of" experience. The only thing that is happening right now, is the experience *you-as-awareness* have taken on the shape of, right now.

> Q1: Right now, how would you describe your experience as your respond to this?

I feel like I am an open space with sensations floating in it, in the form of the experience of sitting at a computer screen typing a message with a very welcome cup of coffee to my right hand side (and therefore in danger of succumbing to any sudden mouse movements). But what matters is, what is *your* experience right now as you read this response?

> Q1: If you are having an experience, how do you reconcile that I also am aware and having an experience?

Not at the same time though, eh? But also, not *not* at the same time. It is more accurate to say that this issue is about how experiences themselves are *outside* of time. Experiences have the *shape* of time (ongoing change) and space (physical extension) - experiences are *formatted* as space and time, space and time are *aspects of* an experience - but there is no space and time *outside* of the experience of them.

The "Hall of Records" metaphor tries to capture this point. I'll attach it below in a moment, as a reply to this comment.

> Q1: I've thought a lot lately about the idea of there only being consciousness. And how I've come to think of it basically is that we are all the same thing but this thing is capable of being anything.

So, being careful there: the idea of there only being *"consciousness"*, which is different from the idea of there only being *"**a** consciousness"*. There's a big difference to that, because the latter would suggest there is only the sensory perspective you are having right now, with no other possibilities, whereas what we are saying is that *all* possibilities are here and now, and so you can have experiences "as if" pretty much anything is true (including all those nice metaphors you've come up with). Leading us to...

> Q1: I've noticed that after hanging around conscious beings for a a day or a few that it's like their dream stuff seeps into mine. For a while after leaving them my reality will be brighter. I'll be seeing all sorts of new plants and such that I had never seen or even knew existed before.

Right, I find this also. We could think of it as, we allow our narrow attentional focus, or subset of the world-pattern, to open up, and our sphere of presence (the subset of the possibilities we allow to contribute to our ongoing experience) then incorporates all those fresh patterns and apparent interactions. When we loosen our hold on our experience this way, the world does often become more dreamlike, because we aren't gripping

onto it with our habits and assumptions so much, we aren't intending in terms of our world views so much. Creativity in action! :-)

The Hall of Records

Imagine that you are a conscious being exploring a Hall of Records for this world. You are connecting to a vast memory bank containing all the possible events, from all the possible perspectives, that might have happened in a world *like this*. Like navigating through an experiential library. Each "experience" is a 3D sensory moment, from the perspective of being-a-person, in a particular situation. And there may be any number of customers perusing the records. So this is not solipsism: Time being meaningless in such a structure, we might say that "eventually" all records will be looked-through, and so there is always consciousness experiencing the other perspectives in a scene.

At the same time, this allows for a complex world-sharing model where influence is permitted, because "influencing events" simply means navigating from one 3D sensory record to another, in alignment with one's intention. This process of navigation could be called *remembering*. Practically, this would involve summoning part of a record in consciousness and having it *auto-complete* by association. This would be called *recall*. You can observe something like this "patterned unfolding" occurring in your direct conscious experience right now.

So in terms of "oneirosophy" you don't need to worry about another "you". You are not even the person you are experiencing, you are simply looking at this particular series of event-memories, from this particular perspective. "Intending" changes in your experience means to decide to recall a memory that is not directly connected to this one. Note that none of this metaphorical stuff is necessarily required though - all that matters is that you are willing to let go of the current experience, and believe that you can connect to another experience which is discontinuous with it. However, these "Active Metaphors" better allow you to format yourself.

[...]

Well, your body *is* an illusion in the sense that it is not what you might have assumed it to be. Being an illusion doesn't mean something doesn't exist - it just means our description of its nature is incorrect. In this case, the body is realised to be an *experience* shaped from *awareness*, rather than an independent external object which is being observed by a separate conscious viewer. It's an illusion in the same way that a photograph of a crowd scene is not actually a bunch of people wandering about on a street.

Other people's bodies are of the same form as yours: sensations and perceptions arising within and as *you-as-awareness*. Your body is just a bunch of sensations plus an idea; you don't really have a body as such. And other people's bodies are basically just visual images, sounds, and textures, just like everything else.

Note: if when you think of other people's bodies, you are thinking about them as if you were "in" those bodies, or are viewing them from a 3d-person perspective (the "view from nowhere"), then you are immediately "wrong" - because what you are doing is imagining that *you-as-awareness* had taken on the shape of a different experience. On the other hand, upon recognising this, you are "right", since you realise that there are no "other people" as such, except as patterns of experience, and that is what "you-as-person" is also.

> Q2: so it's their fact of them existing in my presence that i'm concerned about

I'm not sure what you mean by "existing in my presence"? Firstly, what do you mean by "my presence" and then what would it mean to "exist" in that?

I meant more what your presence *actually is* - but going along with that: when you see "someone" what is it, *exactly*, that you see? What exactly are you experiencing?

> Q2: *but my presence itself is the totality of awareness localized to a particular experience, as in brahma [infinite grid], paramātmā [localized experience] and bhagavān ["my" experience as 'śrī kṛṣṇa']

So, putting aside any interpretation based on mushrooms or contemplation or anything else, you end up with: you are having an experience of *sight-sound-texture-feeling*, with nothing "behind" that. You are experiencing an experience; you are experiencing *being* an experience.

Given this, what are "other people"?

> Q2: other people must be myself

And what are you?

> Q2: परावर parāvara - totality - the universe - everything

Even that, though, is perhaps a little grand and over-reaching, referencing ideas that are not themselves persistent (although I do get that they are metaphorical and trying to "point the way' rather than capture its essence). So -

I'd suggest keeping it simple and phrasing it as something like:

- "What you truly are is *'that which takes on the shape of experiences'*."

Or just "that which experiences", but I think it's useful to go with the formulation above, since it emphasises that there are not two things - the experience and the experiencer - only one thing (really: *no* things). And that is the only thing that is always true: the only *fundamental* truth. Beyond that, things are changeable and are only *relatively* true.

> Q2: how would you encapsulate that in a word?

I think I would probably deliberate *not* do so, since it that word and its conceptual associations would become yet another distraction. If I had to go with one, I'd opt for: **"this"**.

Of course, this (ahem) only makes sense once you have already worked through everything, but that's fine. It's really a recognition that no word can mean what we are talking about here, since what we are talking about here is that from which all meaning is made. (And we're back to the metaphor of no sandcastle being able to capture "the beach" and "sand", while also *being* both of those things.)

[...]

So, the absolutely "obvious" thing is that there is "awareness" and it has no edges and is everything, now. Anyone can get a sense of this by close their eyes right now and trying to:

- a) find the "edges" of your current experience,
- b) find where "you" are in your current experience.

Then you start, say, thinking about "the world", and notice where those thoughts are and what they are made from. From these observations, you get to the *direct fact* that:

- "What you truly are is 'that which experiences' and 'that which takes on the shape of experiences', whose only inherent property is *being-aware*."

Although that statement obviously had to be written in words and use common concepts, that's not a model. You can't actually think about it even because awareness is not an object; the statement is meant to *point* to something, rather than *describe* it. As soon as you think about it, you are doing something else: you are shaping yourself into the experience of a little story and confusing the content of that story with the stuff of which the story is made, which is what you are really wanting to get a handle on.

It is the *context*, which cannot be modelled since everything is *of* it and is *fundamentally* (unchangingly) true - rather than the *content*, which can be described (using parallel structures) and can take on many different relative truths.

So, indeed: depending on what you choose, you can experience a reality "as if" there are no others *or* "as if" there are others. Fundamentally, I suppose strictly speaking there are *neither* "no others" *nor* "others", because there are no fundamental objects at all.

However -

> Q1: It seems likely that I also exist inside of a larger awareness where this is also the case.

This cannot be true. You are thinking of "awareness" as a thing, an object, with edges here. Awareness is not an object though; it is a *subject*. There cannot be multiple awarenesses, because awareness is "before" division and multiplicity. In fact, there is *not even **one*** awareness. That's why we refer to it as "awareness" rather than "**an** awareness" or "**the** awareness".

In fact, it is simply not possible to *think about* awareness at all, because thinking always involves division into objects and relation in mental space. The conceptual object within your thinking that you are calling "awareness" is not actually awareness, it's a mental object which you've attached the label "awareness" to. Ironically, though, your little mental model of lots of little awarenesses is all actually arising *within* awareness! It's the equivalent of imagining that there is an outside to your experience, and then noticing that, of course, your imagined "outside" is itself always "inside" experience. And actually, as we've noted, experience/awareness has no edges and so has neither an "outside" *nor* an "inside". In general, as soon as we start imagining things from the "view from nowhere" - an imaginary perspective that is supposed to be outside of us - we are immediately wrong. Not because such a viewpoint is inaccessible, although there is that; rather, because the underlying assumption that awareness is an object renders the imaginary scheme *meaningless!*

[...]

Well, it's always a struggle to find a decent way to word these things, but it's good to know that there's *something* in there now and again that's useful!

Ha, that's quite entertaining. Attending and intention in action! Really, the descriptions don't matter anyway as such - other than as a way to notice that our experiences are "formatted" or "patterned" within nothing behind them as such, and as a way to formulate new patterns to intend. Once you've "got it", the description doesn't much matter anymore.

On Identity Sense

Just happened to be passing! It's a great topic and something that there are so many ways to talk about. A good one to bring up. So:

- The "you" I'm referring to in the first example isn't the "little you", the one we infer from thoughts and bodily sensation, but rather the true self: the conscious environment. I guess I'm assuming in that phrasing that people already recognise themselves as the "open aware space" in which experiences arise; that they *are* the dream.
- But then in the second example, when I make the dream-space reference more explicitly and say there is no "you", I mean "you" as in the "little you"!

The way I'd written the comment appears that they are different views, but really they are the same view. A good example of why we have to be careful of language here, I suppose! :-)

Actually, in the "filtering of infinite potential" metaphor, that you are experiencing "your own mind" doesn't necessarily imply there is no valuable information to be had from the environment. Because we have the perspective of a "little you" who receives information by sensory arisings, the way we learn about ourselves-as-the-world is through experience.

So listening to people, paying attention to events, tells us who we are at the moment. For instance, seeing lots of news articles about people having appendicitis may be the first sign that you should get checked out at the doctor. It's not just all about seeing owls because you've been thinking about owls, or redirecting events by reconstructing your forward imagery.

Meanwhile, changing ourselves and changing the world are equivalent, and we can only recognise our success in that when our sensory experience shifts accordingly. Again, active and interactive listening.

- *Experiences are all about your current state,*
  because the facts-of-the-world are your current state.

Taking the "two aspects" version of Transcendental Idealism, you would be the noumena (as I call it: the *facts-of-the-world* dissolved into the background of awareness) as much as you were the phenomenal (those aspects of the noumena that had unfolded as spatially-extended sensory experience: an experiential moment). Both are in and of awareness; awareness is what you "really are". In fact, the noumena is always as present as the phenomena, it's just that it is dissolve into the background *felt-sense*.

- *You == world == state of you == state of the world.*

To explore the apparent sensory world is to explore the current formatting of your own mind, and I'd go further and say that the overall formatting is just as present now as the particular element you are experiencing as an expanded environment. Behind that is just infinite potential.

TL;DR: The filter+potential metaphor shouldn't be construed as one-way, because it's a metaphor describing the current state of the larger "you". The environment you encounter then *is* the larger you, and to explore it is to explore the larger mind, so one should always be listening.

> [[Utthana: Metaphors abound. Worldviews are like contortions of the body. You bend to them when you wish to be bent such a way: you sit when you want to sit, you stand when sitting is no good, you lay down when you need to rest, you run when there's a tiger. Anyone who sits forever, or lays forever, or runs forever, is either dead or effectively so. Flexibility. Always flexibility. Adapt, move, never holding on, never saying "this not that" for long.]]

Quite so. "Active Metaphors". Choose for purpose. Don't confuse with explanation.

> [[Nefandi: "*in a response to a recent post /u/triumphantgeorge outlined a model of reality in which there are three features: a you, a filter, and a world.*"; This isn't a fair representation of what George talks about because "the world" is not what you're filtering against in his model. Rather, you're filtering from infinite possibility, which isn't any kind of world. Once you're done filtering, then something resembling the world appears to your mind as your POV experience. Of course the filtering is instant, so "once you're done" is only a figure of speech here.
>
> *"One of the dangers is dismissing the possibility that the other elements in this system, ie the world and the filter, might have something to say, that they might have their own agenda, intelligence, or reasons for appearing the particular ways that they do."*; **What's the danger here?** When you talk about danger, you have to talk about the possibility of injury. **Who is injured here, how, and why?**]]

Thanks Nefandi - this is exactly right.

[...]

[[7kek7: Perhaps you should lose the notion that there are "harder" and "easier" things to manifest. That seems like it would limit you. **In the end it's all really you**]]

[[OmegaAces:

> > but I don't feel an intention for the harder things.

Maybe semantics, but I don't think intention needs feeling. It's more like feeling needs intention, as feelings come after intention. Intention doesn't *have* to involve feeling, intention is being like "x is true" without thoughts, feelings, visualizations, etc. There's many posts around here that explain it thoroughly. What you do feel is the result of that intention, not the intention itself. Also, to be honest with you, the "You must become an adept." comment isn't going to help you, only further confuse you. Linking Bentinho of all people is even worse. There's enough existing material you can find on here, /r/DimensionalJumping, and material that is linked in these subreddits to keep you busy for years (possibly even giving you the tools to allow yourself to transcend the need to get help from other people when it comes to things like this). Don't worry about trying to get answers from new age gurus.]]

Closure

I feel that this was going to happen eventually; it wasn't something that could have been resolved by discussion, and it wasn't really anyone's fault. How do you agree or compromise on fundamental matters of style, with a subject which demands you speak from your identity? Some styles are mutually exclusive, and it's difficult to host both in a single forum, in terms of moderation or amongst subscribers.

So in some ways, although it's obviously somewhat bumpy as transitions go, this is actually probably the most efficient way for it to get sorted. The challenge going forward is that this subreddit and whatever else emerges from these events must clearly set out their stalls in terms of "mode".

Although "nice" isn't always necessarily the best way to grow, it *is* "nice" to have the choice to select the style that works for you in any moment - and maybe that's what will come out of this: an opportunity for people to pursue their chosen way without compromise.

Personally, I'm about *the ideas* whatever context they might be embedded in, and I'm good with whatever communication style does the job at that time. Not so much on the fence, as playing sport badly in the fields either side of the fence simultaneously...

It turns out that the moderators were having a "people-shaped" experience - who knew, eh? Anyway, when two or more directions arise in direct conflict, like with tectonic plates, a shake-up is probably inevitable. And perhaps the use of anger is that is sometimes the most efficient way for a change to happen in strained circumstances.

Non-duality doesn't necessarily correspond to "everyone being nice to each other all the time", even though it's my own preferred approach; non-duality is impersonal. Events arise, this includes apparent interactions between people, sometimes those interactions corresponds to an angry narrative, then that part of the story completes.

Regardless of the manner of its occurrence, the right thing has happened overall. And now, we have a subreddit for one flavour of this topic - a looser forum to explore the perspective "life is dreamlike in nature" - and there will be another for more hard-nosed philosophical discussions of subjective idealism. The right thing doing itself, for everyone.

I wasn't speaking in support of how things played out really - "my preferences lie elsewhere", you might say - and I do get the point you are trying to make overall (why are people shouting into the mirror?). However, it's kind of done now, and the final result is probably the best outcome (in my personal view of course) that doesn't mainly involve, as of this moment, just wishing that situations and people/aspects were different than they are.

"A thing", indeed. :-)

Thank you kindly. If something good has come of this, beyond the overdue bifurcation, it's that lots of people have piped up to explicitly say that they care about the subreddit and the topic it explores. This bodes well for the future!

[...]

[[AesirAnatman: Yeah, before there was r/oneirosophy there was the occult subreddit. Until very recently it had become a meme/picture-sharing place and had lost the community discussion element. There were a lot of great conversations on r/occult back in the day. Sometimes I miss those days, but I guess life and people all move on and change. In an odd synchronicity, I have just very recently been thinking about starting to write a blog or something about these sorts of ideas and/or starting a subreddit (but under a new reddit account that I may soon switch to). So very interesting that you posted this at this time.

My own experience has been complex. Years ago now, maybe 6 years, I got rid of almost all my possessions and started traveling around the USA with just a backpack and a sleeping bag r/vagabond style. I ended up doing some WWOOFing type work such for lodging and food and had some interesting experiences as well as some rough ones. After two years of that I decided I wanted some stability and got a job and an apartment and have been doing that type of life for several years. A couple wonderful relationships with great partners in that time. Recently really started disliking what I currently do for money and looking for ways to earn money in ways that resonate better with my values and beliefs.

Going through some object-relational psychoanalysis has been extremely transformative for me on a personal emotional level, given that I was raised in a cult-like environment by a narcissist. Happy to have changed a lot in a personal way.

As far as mystical-magical stuff, what to say? I'm mostly past the phase of reading. I feel pretty confident in my own perspective and what I believe and why and am more in the process of working that out into life lived, although I am heartily interested in engaging in some conversation around these ideas for pleasure as well as frankly to bolster/build a community interested in them because it can be lonely to not have many people to relate to on a spiritual level. I can tolerate loneliness, but I don't prefer it.

Reality is a dream, an illusion, a product of one's volition. I think that while ordinary psi can be useful, it has limitations and moving beyond it to major psi requires one to deeply dive into one's own manifestation of their waking-dream and their unconscious motivations in that and to embrace them and work through them. So, I'm quite interested in a more mystic flavor of this stuff lately (although with plenty of magick/psi still), transforming one's sense of identity in day to day life from that of a human to that of deity-dreamer, so to speak.

I'm not sure if this subreddit is where I belong or if I'll stay here v. starting another but I welcome the dialogue regardless. At this point I don't think it matters - there was another subreddit that Nefandi wanted kept relatively secret that was created after all of the ridiculous drama several years ago called /r/weirdway that has some posts around these ideas, but that place is dead now, much like this place has been.

I've seen entire threads dedicated to Triumphantgeorge. Personally, **he helped me learn to manifest stuff, that it was possible, and to succeed at it.** He's the closest thing to a Hogwarts professor I've met.]]

/r/DimensionalJumping

Reply to “Possible theory for unintentional jumps”

> >I just think a majority of the subreddit can be explained through other means much easier than the OPs are willing to believe.

You've just made a really good point (although perhaps not the one you intended). There are lot of mysterious situations and changes that people have encountered, and they can be *explained away* easier than supposing a so-called "dimensional jump". However here's the thing: there is no single, consistent explanation that covers *all* the experiences.

Which is not to say they are all "dimensional jumps" - what that explanation does is be so *flexible* as to allow any strange "discontinuities" in experience to be encapsulated by it. But there is definitely "something going on" and our personal worlds seem to be far less stable, solid and persistent than we suppose. This can be dismissed as, say, an illusion or an error of the memory or so on. But those are not actually explanations, they are ad-hoc dismissals. An explanation must answer: how, *exactly*. Meanwhile, the lack of an explanation doesn't make a difference to what is happening, of course, or what is possible. So one must experiment personally to gain an understanding, or admit to oneself that it's an area they aren't interested in exploring, and are happy to remain ignorant of.

The core of it is: Discontinuities in our personal worlds *do* seem to happen. Can this be done *deliberately* for our benefit, rather that simply be a strange and random affliction?

> >Not requiring... They are just words, and words can sometimes separate us if we are unwilling to compromise.

Right. They're not *required* but they can help people, well, connect to an understanding that fits for them. We have to call things *something* or we can't talk about them at all - but the words are just pointers, not the thing itself. This means we're still free to describe things in whatever way is helpful.

Reply to “If you jump into another dimension, with different people and different circumstances, wouldn't that mean that you'd be leaving your reasons for jumping behind?”

You never really "leave any behind" because you never go anywhere. The notion of a "dimension" is really a way of describing how the world can change "as if" it has become a different place. (And it *has* become a different place, but in the manner of a transformation or rebuilding of your "private copy" of the world, rather than physically *going* somewhere.)

So your point becomes: am I erasing the reasons for my making the change? And the answer is, yes, that always true: if you solve a problem, you have shifted from a state of "there is a problem" to "the problem is solved".

Reply to “I get a bit personal here, but I'm having problems jumping.”

> [OP: Ok about a week or two ago I was extremely desperate and tried the 2 glass method. I followed all the steps and tried not to think about it too much. The number hasn't changed, and i've been following this thread for a long time and the number has changed several times so i know it happens.. Could it be I wasn't ready to make this jump yet? Could it be this jump simply wasn't meant to be? Or should I try another method? i lost the best friend i ever had, and she won't talk to me at all, and i just wanted things to be better but they actually got worse since I tried the 2 glasses method of jumping and now she's blocked me on everything and seems to be gone for good. I don't want to give up on this, i'm extremely desperate, at this point i just want to be happy again and not so horribly depressed all the time from losing her. I'm sorry if this is kind of rambled but if anyone can understand what i'm trying to say, do you guys have any input of what I should do jump-wise? Any methods or tricks? Or should I just forget about it and let it be, continue on this path of horrible depression, rejection, and loneliness?]
>
> > Q1: The Glasses Method and most other methods aren't for those kinds of changes -- they're for changes in you.

Well, actually, the whole point of the experiment is that it (potentially) changes *your experience*, and "the world' is in your experience - so "changes in you" includes the world, the apparent person you assume yourself to be, and anything else that arises within the "true you".

> > Q2: I was a bit skeptical of the 2 glasses experiment yet open minded. I did it two weeks ago, and a close relative of mine made a comment about a building that I was not aware that was there. She said it had been there for a year. It was a bit spooky, cause I don't remember that building being there at all, and why would she randomly mention it? I haven't seen the results of what I specifically intended.....but this is interesting so far. I'm getting to the point where I'm more interested at how this reality works instead of directly affecting things, though the latter is still of interest to me.

Skeptical and open minded is the perfect attitude, I think. It's the attitude of, "okay, this sounds interesting, let's see what's going on here, see if there's anything to it". The idea of maintaining the "open verdict" position for things we haven't investigated ourselves, and using provisional acceptance of ideas when required for practical purposes without having to "believe" in them, seems to me to be the correct approach generally.

> > Q2: I agree! There's something I wanted to ask you by the way. What is the most effective form of meditation, in order for one to start seeing this reality for what it truly is? I've dabbled in pretty much all types of meditations in the past, but I haven't decided what to stick to. There are various forms of meditation where you concentrate on an object such as the breath or the mantra, some where you visualize an object, and I'm sure you know of all the other types, such as mindfulness, zazen, etc. It seems that they can all generally lead to the same destination, but with varying results, and some are arguably more efficient. Also, I'm assuming that meditation is necessary....perhaps some forms of contemplation could be a way of meditating too.

Well, it depends on what the purpose of the mediation is, I guess. Some of them seem, to me, to be "tricks" to try and force yourself to maybe have a particular experience, one which would be contrary to your usual mode, and thereby reveal to you that things aren't as you thought. Maybe. If you are lucky. But I'm not sure that's really worthwhile, because you can do this far more directly, since you are *always* "the subject that takes on the shape of experience" anyway. See the little exercise attached below, for example.

However, there's definitely a value in "ceasing to interfere" for periods of time, in the form of a daily releasing exercise (just lie on the floor and "stop interfering" with your body, thoughts, and spatial attention; let whatever happens happen, for ten minutes or so). It helps you release accumulated experiential debris: stuck thoughts and incomplete movements, you might say. Beyond that, the reason to do any meditation is... because you like it.

Feeling Out Exercise

... a little exercise can help give us a direct experience of what it means to be the subject to all experience, to recognise that we are not an object and that we are "unlocated". We might close our eyes and try to:

a) find the "edges" of your current experience.
b) find where "you" are in your current experience. *and:*
c) investigate what your current is experience is "made from". *finally:*
d) think about yourself, and then note the location of that thought and what it is "made from".

The conclusions of this are the *facts* of your experience - the only actual facts, really; everything else is transitory.

Note that this means there is no destination, no path. The fundamental truth is that of the property of *being-aware*, and everything else is relatively true only. All and any experience, therefore, is "made from" that same property, and is at the same "level" of truth. There is no secret to discover in terms of experiential *content*; there is only a recognition of the *context* of all experience.

Reply to “Does the number not changing mean that the jump failed?”

As per the sidebar text: **Header No. 982** - Please note that a shift in your experience does not require a change in the header number, which should be treated as an emblem of change and a symbol of potential rather than an ID.

Because of course, different states of your experience aren't *actually* independently numbered in the form of individual dimensions each with a unique ID - so there is no necessary connection between a change in any particular fact in your ongoing experience and a change in the fact called "the number on the subreddit header".

> I believe we are jumping every second anyway.

From previous discussions: I'm not sure that's a very useful way to think about it, since it seems to conflate apparent change in sensory experience (the observed seeming transition between already-determined *moments* which are aspects of the present state) with "jumping". It is more conceptually helpful, surely, to reserve "jumping" as a term for *deliberate* shifts in state, corresponding to the imposition of a particular fact or outcome. Otherwise the metaphor of "dimensions" no longer has any meaning.

> [Q: The only problem I have with reserving jumping for deliberate shifts is that I think it is easier for people new to altering their experience to transition from believing that things are always shifting to making intentional jumps. It is harder to go from a completely solid reality to making big intentional changes, than to go from an ephemeral reality that is changing all the time to making intentional changes.
>
> I don't think the metaphor of dimensions loses meaning because I conceive of dimensions as configurations of consciousness. To go from one moment to the next, from one room to another, or from one thought to the next, is to change the configuration of your consciousness. Once you realize you are consciousness that is always shifting, it is easier to conceive of making "bigger" changes. The changes are only bigger because of our belief systems, but perhaps it could be as easy to make those shifts as to shift from one mental state to another.]

I do see the reasoning behind the statement - it conveys this idea that things are fluid and therefore it is easier to make changes. "Hey, you are 'jumping' all the time anyway!"

The problem, I feel, is that it makes it harder to reintroduce the idea of deliberate intention coherently later (and to talk about implications). Having used up "jumping" as term for *any* configuration change, we've lost its use as a term when specifying a *particular target outcome* configuration and intending it.

So I'm generally inclined to separate out the following things, to help make things clearer:

1. **"Moment by moment apparent change in sensory experience".** These are *not* changes of state. They are aspects of the *same* static state, within which the full sequence of moments is defined.
2. **"Shifts in state brought about non-deliberately."** This would be when we intend a change in the everyday sense, intervening to redirect of our current experience thus unwittingly implying a new set

of moments. Perhaps just "going to the shop", but also "resisting the content of the current moment". We don't really intend to change the facts of the world in this case, but the worldview assumptions with which we formulate our intention, and its implications, bring about a state change. (We aren't really aware that we are intending here, as such.)

3. **"Shifts in state brought about deliberately."** This is when we conceive of a change we'd like in our ongoing experience - facts of the world, target outcomes, whatever - and knowingly intend that change. *This* would be "jumping". (This is full awareness of making a change, and deliberately using the formulation of "dimensions" when specifying that change, knowingly going beyond the usual assumptions.)

I would then tend to reserve "jumping dimensions" for the final example, where we are making a deliberate change, and we are changing the actual apparent "facts of the world" - such that the results are, just as the name suggests, "as if" we had "switched into a different dimension".

So instead of saying we are "jumping all the time", I would say that: our ongoing experience is in fact not as stable as we assume it to be; that this instability points to the possibility of making deliberate change; and that the concept of "dimensions" is one concept that can be used to harness this.

It *is* pedantic, sure, but also I do think the wording we use makes a difference, and we kind of evolve the descriptions over time. So it's good to have this sort of discussion to bash it out, take on different experiences people have had when talking about this stuff.

For example, linking to what you've just said, it is quite hard to convey the idea that "intending" is not actually a *doing*. That is, it really involves no effort or action at all, and it's not like pushing or manipulating something. In fact, any attempt to "do" an intention is really an intention of something else, and tends to conflict with the main intention (or at least place limits on the ways it can be incorporated into one's ongoing experience). This tends to be something that comes up later, though. At first, we're concentrating on the basic idea that experience is flexible, and there is a special type of "deciding" that is the true cause of change.

But, then, do we sort of plan ahead for that later part of the discussion, by avoiding saying things earlier which will conflict with it, or do we just go with the approach of "oh, that was to just get you started, it's really like *this*"?

Realistically, it's a muddle of both. When it's a one-to-one discussion, it doesn't much matter because you are dynamically correcting things as you go along in the conversation. For one-off comments, though, I'm maybe inclined to be a bit more cautious, because we may never actually get the opportunity to make the later correction, once they've gone off to begin experiments by themselves.

[...]

> [Q: Good points, I see a lot of posts where people don't really seem to understand the fluid nature of experience. "Did I jump or didn't I?", "Did it work", "I did x and nothing changed". I want to make a one-off comment to get them to consider that they are shifting all the time regardless of the outcome. I don't want anyone to walk away thinking that "dimensional jumping" doesn't work because they didn't get the outcome they wanted. I would rather have them think that they did jump, they just didn't achieve the outcome they wanted, because these things can be complicated. For better or worse,

> our belief systems are very complicated. Maybe I should take a little care to explain how I see things in more depth, and maybe not use the word jumping.]

Yes, true about the fluidity. Beyond that, I find the main background issues that come up in posts, are:

a) not recognising the "meta" position of "experiencing" *in general* as distinct from any *particular* experience and the possibility of identifying with that (*context* vs *content*);

b) not recognising the "metaphorical" aspect of all descriptions as being "parallel experiences" (parallel constructions in thought), rather than true explanations that actually correspond to something "behind" experience;

c) not recognising that the ultimate purpose of this subreddit, being framed as an "investigation" into "the nature of experience", means that "beliefs" are something to be examined and unpacked to see how they correspond to direct experience, rather than something to simply be "respected" and applauded;

d) not recognising that just because the content of an experience corresponds to a particular description or belief, it does not mean that the description or belief is "true". Experiences are on an "as if" basis, and many different type of description will correspond, but none of them are "behind" the experience.

Each of these tends to limit the possibility of realising (just *noticing*, really) how flexible one's experience might be, or limit the possibility of having collaborative discussions which might unpack hidden assumptions and help with that (while avoiding exchanges getting emotionally charged due to identification with a particular description, and so on).

Reply to “Seriously, is this real?”

> But how does science confirm it? And why do I need a candle to jump between the mirror thing? Why specifically a candle?

Well, "science" isn't equivalent to "real" or "true"; it's just a particular approach for exploring a particular subset of experience. How does science confirm that you are conscious and aware? It doesn't, and never can, because it's not within its sphere of applicability. Science, as usually thought of, is based around cataloguing a subset of experiences which correspond to the "objective world" container concept. That is, it can't really be applied to many 1st-person experiences, because it is "too late" for that; it filters out things which cannot be (apparently) confirmed by the (apparent experience of seeing or hearing) other people confirming it. However, that doesn't mean you can't conduct your own personal *structured investigation* using similar principles: perform experiments, observe results, repeat results, come up with a description. The only issue is that you won't be able to refer to a stable, external reference point - because the very existence of such a thing is what is ultimately under investigation. Having said all that, some physicists do push at the "objective world" concept in their attempts to explain certain features that have been observed. Quantum Bayesianism, for example, recognises that the "objective world" idea is a relatively recent introduction, and that a model of quantum mechanics might benefit from putting it aside. See:

- *QBism puts the scientist back into science* - Nature
- *A Private View of Quantum Reality* - Quanta
- *What's bad about this habit* - N David Mermin

The last of these is an essay which emphasises how the concepts we use in science are *abstractions*, and we must be careful not to reify and treat them as "real things that are out there". That is why, here, we often make reference to the fact that descriptions are "parallel constructions in thought", rather than something which gets "behind" the *world-as-it-is*. Descriptions and theories are, in fact, also just more experiences at the same "level" as any other experience - that is, the experience of "thinking about a description".

Finally, as an illustration of this last point, it can be useful to take a moment and attend to your *actual experience*, and distinguish between your true situation (that of the context of all experiences) rather than what you might *think about* it (which would just be more experiential content). See for example:

Feeling Out Exercise

... a little exercise can help give us a direct experience of what it means to be the subject to all experience, to recognise that we are not an object and that we are "unlocated". We might close our eyes and try to:

a) find the "edges" of your current experience.
b) find where "you" are in your current experience. *and:*
c) investigate what your current is experience is "made from". *finally:*
d) think about yourself, and then note the location of that thought and what it is "made from".

The conclusions of this are the *direct facts* of your experience - the only actual facts, really; everything else is transitory. Whatever you *think about* your experience is also another experience within this context. You can never get "behind" or "outside" of this, because it has not edges or boundaries; there *is*

no behind or outside. (If you think otherwise, then pause and notice that your thought about this is *also* "within" and "inside".)

[...]

> > I honestly think this is just a big joke. That, or people here are no different from people who believe in Gods and shit.

Well, shit is definitely real. If you don't agree, maybe try doing the two glasses exercise with roughage rather than water. I guarantee results!

More seriously, a difference between "people who believe in Gods and shit" and the topic of this subreddit is that they, in general, haven't had any actual experiences, haven't conducted any experiments. They *just* believe. Here, the idea is that you put aside what you *think about* the world (what you "believe") and conduct an experiment or two and see what happens. *Results* are what informs your view; whether there's something to this *or not* comes from trying it out. And the "something" in question might not even be what you assume it to be.

As the sidebar takes time to emphasise: It is for readers to decide for themselves through personal investigation and introspection whether jumping is appropriate for them or not. An open mind combined with healthy caution is the correct mindset for all approaches targeted at the subjective experience. Never believe something without personal evidence; never dismiss something without personal evidence.

Again, just *thinking about* things will only tell you about your own beliefs and assumptions, it won't tell you anything about whether something actually works or not, about the *world-as-it-is* and the "nature of experiencing". Of course, it is equally fine to simply dismiss it and not bother, seeing it as not being worth the effort. However, you can't reasonably conclude, then, whether it is possible to generate an experience, and what the nature of those experience might be if so.

I mean, it's not like it's hard to find out: it is *literally* no more difficult than transferring water between receptacles. You've probably spent more time commenting on this thread than it would have taken you to just choose a target outcome and *do it*.

> > See it's this shit like this that convinces me this ought to be true. But, alright, if this is true, (I'll play for a while...) then how come you guys aren't alerting people that this could be a revolutionary life-changing shit? I mean, if more people researched on this, hell, we could be gods in control of our destiny. A bit too literally on that.

Well, I think that the underlying thinking and observations *have* been promoted at various times - Buddhism and other traditions are inclined towards similar ideas, and so on.

However, there are a few issues when it comes to promoting research:

- It can only be explored personally, from a subjective or 1st-person perspective, because it is "before" the 3rd-person objective view;
- The default assumptions of our concept of "the world", the platform upon which we usually work through our ideas, is exactly the thing that you end up challenging - that is, the idea that the world is a

"stable, simply-shared, spatially-extended place unfolding in time" with you as an "object" within it, as per the usual description.

- That in the end you can't actually *think about* this at all as such, because thinking *is itself* an experience, rather than something that can get "behind' experience.

Ultimately, then, you can't "understand" this sort of thing, can't comprehend "how it works", because conceptual understanding is "too late", and there *is* no persistent independent "how things work" in terms of a mechanism for experiencing. We are forced to confront the fact that "the world" is a concept that we think about now and again, which does not necessarily correspond very well to our actual experiences.

The problem becomes, then, that descriptions of this are fairly meaningless without the actual experience. Descriptions are pointers to the experience - like "red" is to *red*, without experiencing *red*, "red" is nonsensical. That's why there's all this encouragement to actually conduct some experiments, and also why it is suggested that the eventual aim might not about event-based outcomes really, but about investigating the "nature of experiencing" itself (the nature of *the-world-as-it-is* and your relationship with it).

As this thread demonstrates, though, most people want to "work things out" in thought, rather than actually try something practically, particularly when that something doesn't have a certain outcome. (This tendency doesn't just apply to "dimensional jumping", I might add. People want to "pre-know" things before acting in everyday life too.)

Reply to “What if someone I know does it? What happens to "my" them?”

We should bear in mind that "worldlines" and so on are just metaphors. You might have experiences "as if" there were such things, but there are not, in fact, lots of people in different threads. As soon as you envisage something in "diagrammatic" form in the 3rd-person (the "view from nowhere") you are immediately "wrong", in the sense that there no such underlying basis to experience - the though of it *is itself just an experience*, still within your perspective. You never get "outside" of *you-as-awareness*.

Having said that, if these ideas are appealing and you absorb them, they can be useful for creating a worldview you like because it feels the most appealing and "understandable", or even to pattern your experience. And it does fill a placeholder when it comes to the unthinkable issue of "what are other people in terms of jumping". However, these descriptions are never "how things really are behind the scenes" (because there is no "behind the scenes"). Keeping this in mind helps us retain our flexibility of both thought and potential.

The *Hall of Records* metaphor tries to fulfil that purpose. A metaphor can't be *right*, but it can try to avoid or indicate the unavoidable error that results from trying to think about something that is "before" thought, is "before" the formatting of division and multiplicity (which are aspects of experiences, not aspects of *the-world-as-it-is*, necessarily).

I guess it would be good here define what is meant by a "reality" and what is meant by a "you"? What do you mean by those terms? I think that's probably the root of our disagreement here (if there is one, and actually there might not be, fundamentally).

However, let's try -

> > However, you might be talking about the concept/pattern of which I was applying to reality. You'd be right in thinking its wrong (it probably is) but wrong in thinking theres no basis for this idea. Reality itself serves as the basis for all ideas.

Okay, so if by "reality" you mean "the main strand of experience", then what I would describe as "jumping" would be the imposition of a pattern onto that main strand. Essentially, "intensifying the relative contribution" of that fact/pattern in one's state, and there one's ongoing experience. Ideas for such patterns might arise in the main strand or in any parallel strands (by which I mean: thoughts). Basically, they come from experience in any of its aspects.

I usually avoid the word "reality" because I think it's become quite a messy term that gets used for lots of different things, but I would say that perhaps: what is *real* is that which does not change. Following from this, the only thing that is "real" is "that which is aware" and "takes on the shape of experiences". The only facts that are always true and can be checked at any time by attending to direct experience:

- What I am is *that which is aware* - a sort of "material" whose only inherent property is *being-aware*, and which is not an object, and has no "edge" or "outside".
- I am having an experience, and I am aware of having an experience.
- Those experiences I have are "made from" me - I am that which "takes on the shape of" experiences.

These are really the same fact, of course, once you strip away the duality that language has introduced. So that leads to: **reality == awareness.**

> No, because it [the senses] tells us there IS something outside our awareness.

Does it, though? Even your thought about an outside, is inside. We might say that not all of our experience is expanded out into a 3D multi-sensory format.

> Your ideas on the nature of reality are simply an interchangeable metaphor just like mine is.

The important thing is, though, that it recognises itself as a metaphor - and that *the-world-as-it-is* can never be captured in a metaphor, because it at the same level as a metaphor. It seeks simply to be the most flexible way to describe patterns. It's not intended to be a theory of "how reality works" - but there *is* no "how reality works". The idea of there being a "how things work" exists in thought, not in the world.

> It is a usefull patern used to trick your brain out of its own current patterns to test the boundaries of reality and cause changes.

What brain? But you're right: the ultimate point of any metaphor is that it allows you to conceive of experiences that you could not formulate otherwise, and that having done so your intention will also intend that worldview by implication.

World lines are good for that too - but we should be careful we don't start viewing them as "true" in some fundamental way. One might have experiences "as if" they exist one day, and then have experiences "as if" they don't another day. The way in which they exist, then, are as patterns of experience, not "out there" in some independent way.

> The reason I go with the worldlines theory rather than your own is that their appears to currently be more data supporting the idea of mutliple realities...

What data? By which I mean, when pondering this sort of thing, what would or should count as data?

You're right: all we can prove (to ourselves) is the nature of our direct experience right now, plus infer from the experiences we produce what the limits are. Taking the two together, I suggest the *is* no stable truth in terms of objects or patterns. There is no solid underlying persistent substrate at all in that sense.

> First Cause may be casued by awareness or it may not be. It may seem like First Cause is a concept that exists due to or awareness but since our perception of reality is flawed we can never say for sure if we were the ones behind the First Cause or if it was some other entity/pattern (or even that there isnt a First Cause).

First cause isn't "caused" by awareness, though: it *is* awareness. It's a phrase to describe that awareness is self-modifying - like a shape-shifter, you might say. Nothing "causes" awareness to change, and any apparent causes and effects you observe are in fact *all* "results" in that sense.

We could imagine this as being like a landscape of "moments" which can reform itself into a new pattern. A walker who explored the landscape subsequently would encounter one feature or moment, then another. To him, it might seem as if one feature "caused" the other feature - but in fact all features would be a result of the reshaping of the landscape: "first cause". (Note: the metaphorical landscape here would be a full static definition across all moments; and even "time passing" would be a static pattern, actually.)

I'd add that it makes no sense to talk of some other entity/pattern in this context. Those would be *apparent* interactions, but both the entity and the object it operated on would be aspects of the patterned landscape. The entity wouldn't cause anything; it's apparent actions would be a result.

That's how I'm thinking of this, anyway.

[...]

Causes and Awareness

> What I guess I'm getting at here is that if we are indeed aware there's something we have to be aware of that would cause this awareness.

I'd say that this is exactly where the "solution" lies, for want of a better term. What can cause awareness? Note that by "awareness" we have to be careful, and I deliberately don't use the world "consciousness" because that word has been kind of ruined. Different meanings of that word tend to get mixed up: namely "consciousness-of" (being aware of an experience), "self-consciousness" (identifying with a certain part of experience as "you"), and "consciousness" (a non-object material that just *is*). I'm referring to something like the last one here. So by "awareness" I mean a sort of *non-material "material"* - basically "that which is". It isn't "caused", it just "is". In fact "causation" is something at is "after" or "made from" awareness. Since awareness has no inherent properties other than *being-aware*, it makes no sense to talk of it in terms of spatial or temporal characteristics. Nothing can cause awareness, and nothing can cause experience.

Unfortunately, language and thought are themselves contents of experience, and although awareness itself is not an object, the contents of experience are. This is why we can't really formulate a description of awareness or think about it. It never "makes sense" in those terms. We can only *be* it and directly *know/realise* it. And that, actually, is how you come to adopt this view: not by working it out intellectually, but by attending to your direct experience *as it is*, and recognising its properties.

Right now, you could pause a notice that - even thought you are having an experience of apparently being "over here" while this screen is "over there" - that in fact you are located "everywhere" within experience, and that your experience has no edges. For example, pause and direct your attention at these words. Now, direct your attention to "the place you are looking out from". What do you find there? Now keep going. What do you discover?

> I also think that our definitions of "first cause" were somewhat different leading to some confusion...

Ah, right. I understand where you were coming from now.

Truth Behind Patterns

> Altogether though I think it comes down to a fundamental disagreement: you believe there is no "truth behind the patterns" while I maintain there is. In the end I would argue that both methods are flexible enough to be perfectly valid. Let us just agree to disagree.

What I would say though, is that the patterns *are* the truth. Actually, what I'd say is that all that is true is "awareness" and the shape it has taken on. There *is* nothing else. If there was a "behind" to a particular pattern (made from awareness), then that "behind" would *also* be a pattern (made from awareness).

It's a little like, no matter what thoughts you have about the world or about an "outside" to awareness, those thoughts are still themselves *within and made from awareness*. Thoughts about experiences are themselves experiences. Right - all at the same level, while incorrectly thinking that you are getting deeper into some hierarchy. Reusing an example: It's like seeing a coffee table and, examining it more closely, seeing wood, wood grain, molecules, atoms... but you are not getting deeper really, you aren't getting "behind" the table: you are just having different experiences at the same level.

So we don't necessarily have to "agree to disagree" I think, because we are talking about slightly different things. Although I am saying that awareness has no *inherent* structure, that does not mean we do not at present have an *accumulated* structure from all the various intentions and their implications to date.

This description doesn't say there is no format or factual aspect to things - it simply says that all formatting and facts are open to amendment, and that this is possible because all current structure is *you-as-awareness* "shaped" into a particular, and the only true causal mechanism is the shape-shifting "first cause" ability of awareness to adopt a new state. If this were not the case, neither experience nor amendment would be possible (how could you interact across a boundary of type? how could you experience across a boundary of type?).

So, we can absolutely adopt "world lines" as a pattern and have experiences "as if" they were true. And we can also adopt "a infinite gloop of all possible moments" and have experiences "as if" that is true. The default pattern for most people is: "independent people within a shared spatially-extended place unfolding in time", and so they have experiences "as if" *that* is true (and then think we are crazy for talking about all this stuff, fair enough!).

Outline of a Model

Anyway, I hope that's a bit clearer. The very loose bullet-point outline for the "patterning" description would be something like this, written as assertions for simplicity:

- What you truly are, is "awareness". Or for poetic purposes: an "open space of awareness which takes on the shape of states and experiences" and whose only inherent property is *being-aware*.
- Dissolved within this awareness are all possible facts, patterns and experiences - which exist eternally. All possible patterns are present and active within experience, always.
- Awareness is always in a particular "state" - even if that is a flat state where no patterns are dominant, corresponding to a "void" experience. A state includes all base formatting (including apparent time/space aspects), perceptual formatting, world facts, events and so on. This state defines the *facts-of-the-world* and hence your ongoing experience.
- A "state" can be said to correspond to a particular distribution of relative intensities of patterns. We might say that awareness "takes on the shape of" a particular state and hence a fully-defined state of experiences. This can be imagined as a sort of "landscape" which defines all moments across all time. "Time passing" is itself a static pattern, which can be likened to a fixed trajectory of attentional focus across a the landscape of moments.
- A "state", then, is fully defined and fully deterministic.

- However, the landscape can be "shifted" by altering the relative intensities of the constituent patterns. This amounts to awareness "taking on the shape of" a different distribution, hence a different state with a different deterministic set of moments. (This is where things like "dimensional jumping" fit in.)
- Such shifts are done by "intending". To "intend" is to increase the intensity of a particular pattern ("the intention"), either directly or by implication.
- "Intending" amounts to something like "thinking the fact of something being true", but it is not a thought with an *object* as its target - this is an unbounded "objectless, subjective" thought: one thinks it by "bringing it to mind" or "selecting the pattern" or "contemplating the fact". One is "adopting the shape of" a state that incorporates that pattern. There is no technique to intending; one simply intends. (It also can't really be described!)
- Practically speaking, one often tends to intend by implication, using misdirection. That is, one performs some mental or physical task (which is itself intention!) with the understanding that this *means-that* your target pattern is true. Examples can actually be as simple as simply "asserting", "declaring" or "commanding" that something is true. All it has to accomplish, is triggering into prominence that particular pattern by implying it - without obstruction.
- The world, then, is essentially a persistent or maintained thought *of* a world, shaped from awareness, which can be revised by thinking of a different world, again as awareness.

Again, note that the model isn't "true" - what it aims to do is be the most generalised description for *structured experiences*, the minimum model that "makes sense" can be thought in terms of. It captures the maximum scope of "as if" experiences and allows them to make sense, by going to a "meta" level that is "before" the world-pattern (but "after" awareness, of course).

To emphasise: what is *inherently* true is only ascertained by directly attending to experience as it is, now, and not by thinking about it. Which is why people meditate and stuff. But I think you can infer this understanding by repeatedly adopting a worldview, noting that your ongoing experience tends to fall in line with it "as if" it were true, until it becomes clear that there is *no* fundamental "how things are" or "how things work", other than the *fact that you are 'that which is experiencing and experience'.*

Whew. Okay, I think that covers my perspective as best it can be covered at present. It's nice to be pushed to clarify things anyway.

[...]

> > I care for my friend very much and I don't want to lose him. I know it isn't a physical body-switching thing, but if "he" goes to another dimension, what is left here? Does he vanish? Is what remains in his body a version of himself that didn't succeed in jumping? Does he switch with the version of himself in the dimension he jumped to?

So, in fact I'd say that your issue isn't *really* about what happens to him if a jump takes place - it's about what he (and you) are *now*. Basically, it doesn't work that way. You have to think of everything in terms of your own subjective experience. If you experience him doing a jump, then it is really *your experience of him performing a jump* - it is part of *your* "world-pattern" and is an outcome or implication of *your own* intention.

Your friend doesn't go anywhere, because there is no "person" behind/inside your friend - he is made from "awareness", currently as images and sound and so on, patterned. Similarly, you are not a person either: there is no "person" behind your body, *you* are "awareness". Right now, "awareness" has taken on the shape of the perspective of *you-as-person*. You feel that you are *you-as-person*, but really you are always "awareness" and have "first cause" influence as a result.

It's like this is your "private copy" of the world - at this moment. There is no "outside" to awareness, and there is nothing "behind" the experiences you are having - except awareness. It's all *you-as-awareness*. Some other "time", "eventually", *you-as-awareness* might take on the shape of your friend's perspective, and have experiences from that point of view (and be mission controller in exactly the same way, but perhaps not realise it). But for now, you are effectively the god of your own copy of the world, and there is nothing else because it is *made from you*.

TL;DR: You can ponder a lot of metaphysics, or you can simply accept that it just doesn't work that way and so there's no need to worry.

As soon as we start talking about multiple "moments" or "places" though, we are making an error. It's not that it's *wrong* as such - it's that it is *meaningless*, in the sense that this cannot be talked about conceptually.

"Moments" and "places" only exist as an aspect of, part of the formatting of, an *experience*, and not outside of it. "Awareness" itself has no inherent properties other than *being-aware* - and so things like division, multiplicity, location, place, space, time are things that awareness can "take on the shape of", but it is incorrect to talk of those "shapes" being "in" a place or time, and so on. But so long as we keep in mind that we're talking metaphorically - and that although we might even pattern our experience with those metaphors ("active metaphors") such that we have experiences "as if" they were true, they are not *fundmentally* true - we get the best of all (ahem) worlds. The main reason I bring this up in such a pedantic way, is that recognising this frees you from trying to wrestle to understand this - that is, create a parallel construction in thought which corresponds to it - because it is not actually possible. Again it's like trying to build a sandcastle which captures both "the beach" and "sand" - it *is* those two things, but it cannot *contain* them, and can never be *identical* with them. Descriptions and "understandings" need to be recognised for what they are: yet more experiences, on the same level, and not something which gets "behind" experiences.

> couldn't that be all placed within one 'strand of thought' - i.e., a strand of thought that contains all the possible apparent multiplicity

I'd say that all the possible apparent multiplicity is *within awareness*, but of course you could have an experience "as if" all multiplicity is within a strand, perhaps even in some visual way - but that itself would be a selection from all possible patterns. We're really just tinkering with concepts here. There's only ever really "experience", and "strands" are just a nice way of talking about a certain type of overall experience where things seem "parallel".

> yes, because there is no objective time in the universe - only relative time, which disappears as soon as i create a new 'experience'/'scenario'

I'd agree. "Time" is a concept, "change" is an aspect of an experience and doesn't "happen" outside of that experience, in the same way that a contour doesn't happen independently of the mountain, and a stream doesn't happen independently of flowing water, etc.

> intending to eliminate all errors in perception

What counts as an error in perception? To me, I suppose an error in perception is to think that there is something "behind" experience. If one perceives an experience *as being awareness* and recognises that thoughts arising with that experience *are also awareness*, then one is not in error, since one recognises the true nature of the overall experience.

> right, that is where one gets into an infinite loop of trying-to-apprehend that-which-cannot-be-apprehended and end up creating more and more fictitious scenarios without actually solving anything

Right - all at the same level, while incorrectly thinking that you are getting deeper into some hierarchy. Like seeing a coffee table and, examining it more closely, seeing wood, wood grain, molecules, atoms... but you are not getting deeper really, you aren't getting "behind" the table; you are just having different experiences at the same level.

Reply to “Should I really try this?”

> [Q; Haha. Sure, try it. Sit in front of a mirror with a candle and concentrate as much as possible. Everything that will happen is that you waste some time of your day. Sorry that you'll hear it from me but you will never change your dimension. You'll be stuck with your current state, your bad grades and nothing will ever change this. Only *you* can change it yourself by getting off your ass and do something against it on your own, like learning more to get better grades and try/work hard to find a decent job.
>
> Supernatural stuff doesn't exist on earth. I don't know if any of the Religions out there are true or false and if an afterlife in heaven or something like that exists but right here, right now, you and any human on earth including all the people here in Reddit will never experience supernatural stuff. You can't jump dimensions, you can't bend a spoon with your mind and you shouldn't believe stupid stuff other people tell you.]

Have you tried it? Now, some people get carried away, for sure, but if you commit to it you are pretty much guaranteed to encounter some subsequent effects. People get hung up on the "dimensions" imagery, but it's really part of a much older idea: consciousness as primary, the apparent world experience as illusory. Or in philosophy, that the *world-as-it-is* is an "infinite gloop", which is formatted into meaning by the mind which perceives it. Shift your own patterning/filtering, shift your experience. Your milage may vary...

[...]

> > Your "much older idea: consciousness as primary, the apparent world experience as illusory" is nonsense. It's Idiocy.

I think you misunderstand this whole thing. First, I would never suggest someone believe something without putting it to the test. This is easy done in this case. If it's just a bit of a laugh, that's fine too.

On "consciousness is primary", you probably haven't done enough reading to understand the way in which that is meant. It's got nothing to do with imagination and belief as you describe. In philosophy, you might check out panpsychism and idealism; in older traditions, Hinduism and Buddhism and even early Christianity. For a modern take, cognitive scientist Donald Hoffman's interface theory is worth a look.

> > I get your point put you have to differentiate between religion and superstition.

Well, religions now are largely a bastardisation of their original form. There's a lot we could go in here, but the Western religions are really a mutated, cut-down version of a more mystical approach to living. They have taken literally what was intended as metaphorical, and have lots the original message and replaced it with something far more dubious - I would say.

> > I don't want you or anyone else in this subreddit to change anything of their way of thinking.

That is absolutely not what this subreddit is about. It's very much about: "here's an experience, check it out".

> > They just need a single comment that tells them that the stuff here is not true to understand that there are two sides.

But that's not how to do it (in my opinion). They shouldn't be believing anyone who says "this is true" or "this is *not* true". I think you are working against your aim by doing this. What you really mean to say is: people should think for themselves, right?

> If there isn't a single comment anywhere about all this being a joke...

Well, it's not a joke. You *do* make a good point, and I'm going to take on this suggestion. That good point is: we might better emphasise in the sidebar that people should make up their own minds.

> By the way, i'm not a native english speaker so sorry for any bad wording, inappropriate words or sentences that are difficult to understand.

No problem. I appreciate that you are coming from a "good place" on this. But I also think you have maybe come to this subreddit with preconceptions - perhaps due to that /r/nosleep post (which I think is quite unfortunate).

> Religions really changed a lot and are a bastardization of their original form.

The original ideas were about *empowerment* of the people. It's really sad to see how it has been flipped around. Certainly in religions where there is an "entity god" to be feared and who passed down moral laws and punishments! "Non-religion" religions like Zen Buddhism seem to have retained more of the original concept - giving people ways to have a better life - but even they get mangled when they are translated into western ideas, often.

Neville Goddard (who I mention in a post here) interpreted the Christian Bible as describing different metaphors for approaching living. In effect, he is talking about using the mind to set goals, and so on. Quite a lot of the stories in the Bible are about the relationship between mind and body, imagination and perception, and between action and results (including moral action). There's a lot of metaphysics in the Bible. Unfortunately, those stories are now taken literally, as if the people were actual people, rather than symbols for certain relationships. All that knowledge gets lost and becomes about being obedient rather than thinking for ourselves. Shame.

> Yes, but I need to explain this a little closer again so that you exactly understand what I mean: I read in a thread about a confused person...

Your basic idea is absolutely right - in that as more subscribers appear, they don't maybe understand the context of this. That's why I've added a note to emphasise how one should approach this sort of thing. I would much rather just *assume* that people would think critically, make their own judgements, perform their own experiments - but it does no harm (and much good) to emphasise the position taken in this subreddit. (In other subreddits, such as /r/Oneirosophy which is about studying perception from a subjective idealist point of view, there are explicit warnings and that is a valid idea.)

> Well yeah, everyone has his personal preconceptions, I'm sure of this. I usually lean my preconceptions on experiences and facts and not on what a random person said.

The way I think of this: I never take my own thoughts too seriously. I never "believe" my own thinking. That way, I'm happy to change and see things differently according to new experiences I might have, or new information I might come across.

> ...nosleep is about horror stories, so I can assume that the story didn't have a nice ending.

The "new" story has the guy "jumping" into a dimension where he discovers he has just murdered his parents (bummer). The original story for the subreddit is actually about an experience someone had with mirrors (follow the sidebar link) which was kicked from /r/nosleep for not being believable (ironically).

Personally, I think having /r/nosleep stories now using the concept *and linking to this subreddit* is not a good thing. Not much we can do about it though.

> But some things depend on the religion.

Very true. I think the 'insights' are about the same thing, however they are of course filtered through the culture of the time, and then filtered through history, idea, and power-struggles. Maybe that's why the information needs 'refreshed' periodically - insights are re-discovered and re-presented, to make them understandable again.

> In general, most people think for themselves and make their own judgements but...

Yes, I do agree wholeheartedly with this, as a moderator for both subreddits. This one only recently kicked off; at first it was a pretty focused set of people and it wasn't very likely that anyone would happen across it uneducated. It's important to be informed in things where real effects are produced but explanations are lacking. Often people joke around with such things - and then they get a result, and it's not such a laugh anymore.

> I thought nosleep is about fictional stories because the first post I ever saw was the Dimensional Jump one.

Yeah, /r/nosleep is indeed mostly fictional; don't read it myself. As with all those subreddits, there is some confusion, but that one is intended to be "fictional but play along" whereas /r/thetruthishere is about "true unexplained mysterious events" and /r/Glitch_in_the_Matrix is intended to be fairly dry reports about unusual experiences.

> I don't deny that mysterious events can occur. But they are only mysterious events as long as we don't yet have a plausible scientific explanation for it.

Well, not all explanations are "scientific" because that only deals with a certain methodology - but I certainly agree. There is no such thing as *supernatural*, there are only experiences for which we do not have an account. For some experiences, perhaps we never will. But that doesn't mean they are "beyond reality".

> Unusual experiences are great but if they really occured, then there just be an explanation for them.

We are not so far apart really. If someone experiences something, they experienced it. Whatever the *nature* of that experience is, that's for discussion. In many cases we may never know - in others, we might gather enough anecdotes to come up with a theory.

> Nothing can occur that is impossible with our laws of nature (aka what science has discovered so far).

Of course, the "laws" of nature don't say what is possible or impossible. They are not laws in that sense (they don't say "what is legal"). Rather, they are the simplest regularities we have observed, with the broadest applicability. They are "conclusions from the evidence so far". If an observation is made which is contrary to

one of these regularities, then we try to rework the theory to fit the observation. That's what science is all about. Actually, Wikipedia for a change has a pretty good definition of a physical law. (One of my pet hates is that people confuse the notion of a fixed or "given" law with the idea of a "physical law". If we'd taken that viewpoint in previous centuries, we wouldn't have got anywhere.)

Reply to “Do you need to drink all the water to jump?”

> OP (AthleticsTix aka. A Massive Faggot): Wondering because I often find myself trying to shake the water out of the glass into my mouth because I think it won't work.

There is no need to get too obsessed with the details here. The intention and commitment is what matters most. I would definitely drink the full glass however. Other drinks might be fine but they usually come with extra personal associations, so why would you not use water?

EDIT: Note, this was mostly a reference to this comment by OP:

> OP: Also, if I drink half of the water, will I half-jump? Or will it just pause so I can continue later? May I use other drinks?

Although it might be fun to think of "what ifs", actually you should seek to avoid overcomplicating it for no additional benefit. The more you mess around, the more you are introducing additional associations that you can't anticipate. If you are doing the exercise with the expectation that it will work, then it would seem silly to take the risk - it would be like having a teleport machine and wondering what happens if you only step halfway into it, or only type in some of the coordinates, or set the teleport beam to a lower intensity. Good luck with that! ;-)

(More accurately: it's like using a technique to change the structure of your mind but only following half the instructions.)

[[OP:

> The intention and commitment is what matters most

Got it, so if it doesn't work, it is my fault. Just my intent and "commitment". How may I further seek enlightenment?

> There is no need to get too obsessed with the details here.

I don't think I'm obsessed over details, just trying to ask you some questions due to the original instructions being unclear.]]

Why are you so upset? (**EDIT:** You edited. Previously there was an insulting line about being a fuck-up who never graduated from school. **EDIT2:** You edited *again* to add the final sentence, which does I suppose make you *seem* more sincere and worth engaging with, but you added it *an hour and a half* after you posted the comment in its original form - too little, too late, the damage was already done.)

It's just an exercise to demonstrate something about the mind and the world, and people can take or leave it. Nobody's promising anything, or even promoting anything. If it doesn't work, it doesn't work, and people can just move on. You sound like someone who... probably hasn't thought about things very much.

> OP: I'm not upset, you must be talking about another dimension. I'm only asking you if you support users attempting to cure their social anxiety and other psychological issues with your subreddit?

I support users doing whatever they want. If someone has social anxiety, then they can "attempt" to fix it with prescribed pills, or "attempt" to fix it with counseling, or "attempt" to fix it with hypnosis, or "attempt" anything else they want. Whatever's helpful, is good, regardless of ideological concerns.

[[OP: Why the quotation marks? Also can you elaborate on this part and why you brought up ideological concerns? Do you see any ideological concerns in supporting the use of dimensional jumping to "attempt" to cure psychological illnesses?

> Whatever's helpful, is good, regardless of ideological concerns.]]

The quotes were to emphasise you own use of the word attempt, which implied there were other guaranteed, proven, theoretically sound approaches to curing, say, social anxiety. I haven't encountered any (although there are many things that can help to some extent). I brought up ideological concerns, because approaches shouldn't dismissed (or accepted) on the basis of narrative concerns alone. You do realise that "dimensional jumping" is a metaphor, right? It's not about literally teleporting to other physical realms. Also, it is not particularly about curing psychological illnesses (although someone could certainly use that as the target for experimentation). In effect, it's a demonstration that experience is someone philosophically idealist.

Separately though, we might wonder what the nature of a "psychological illness" is, exactly, of course. That such things exists is apparent, but what they *are* isn't very clear.

[[OP: Also, you never elaborated on this quote, I hope you aren't trying to avoid it:

> If you are doing the exercise with the expectation that it will work, then it would seem silly to take the risk - it would be like having a teleport machine and wondering what happens if you only step halfway into it, or only type in some of the coordinates, or set the teleport beam to a lower intensity. Good luck with that! ;-)]]

First, a suggestion: if you actually want to have a discussion about this, you should adjust your tone and be less aggressive/defensive. If you just want an argument, you can take it elsewhere. So, not sure what you are asking about that quote? The suggestion is, that if you are going to perform an exercise of some kind, with a result in mind, why would you only half do it or not otherwise follow the instructions?

> [OP: *"if you actually want to have a discussion about this, you should adjust your tone and be less aggressive/defensive. If you just want an argument, you can take it elsewhere."*; So, if I actually want to have a discussion about this, I'd better obey your suggestions? I've only noticed defensiveness from you, to be honest. Are you sensing aggression in me? Do you feel threatened? You seem to be avoiding my simple requests for you to elaborate on this concept you created. Also, are you familiar with satire? If so, how does satire relate to the subjects we discuss?]

No, I don't feel threatened because... well, I'm not here to defend anything or persuade you of anything. I'm happy to *discuss* things. If you want to engage in satire - great, knock yourself out. But it probably makes sense to actually understanding the nature of what you're satirising first; that's what I do.

You seem awfully emotionally hyped about all this. Why?

> [OP: *"You seem awfully emotionally hyped about all this. Why?";* I'm not, what makes you *feel* that way? You seem awfully defensive and have projected some of your insecurities onto me. Did you notice that? Also, are you implying that I don't understand satire? Here is the definition: "the use of

> **humor**, **irony**, **exaggeration**, **sarcasm** or **ridicule** to expose and criticize people's **stupidity** or **vices**, particularly in the context of contemporary politics and other **topical issues**."
>
> You didn't think that satire was just acting like you were the subject of your criticism just to criticize it, did you? Because that's not what I'm doing. Satire has many forms. Literal forms.]

Oh, don't be so tiresome. I didn't imply at all that you didn't know what satire was. You didn't read my comment properly:

> > it probably makes sense to actually understanding the nature *of what you're satirising* first

As in, if you are going to be satirical, you have to be satirical *about the actual thing itself*, not about some parallel idea you have about it. Otherwise you are just being unpleasant. Since you're not *actually* engaging with the discussion, there's not much point to this. I'm happy to bounce back and forward in some wordplay usually, if it's entertaining. You do seem to be under the impression that I'm defending some sort of position here, though!

> This is only relative to your endurance not matching mine.

Ah, so this is a battle of wits, a challenge of persistence and strength, to win through attrition? ;-)

I dunno - why do you care about "winning" at all? What is there even to win here? I'm not even trying to persuade you of anything; there's nothing to persuade you of, in fact. Your idea of your situation here, of the context of this chat, appears to be... incorrect.

> > How many things, according to you, is one allowed to satirize at the same time?

See, you've missed the mark again. My point was, plainly, that in order to satire something, you need to know what it is you are satirising. Since you blundered into this subreddit, all ready to triumph over ignorance, all you've done is revealed that you don't really know what the target is.

> > Do you know that /r/ThreeKings is a child of the fiction sub /r/nosleep?

Well, it's an offshoot inspired by it. The actual ritual (and related: the doors of perception one) has a long history, related to entering a detached mental state. As I say though, that predates my involvement.

Related post on the nature of perception: *Darkroom Vision*. Fascinating stuff.

> [OP: *"I dunno - why do you care about "winning" at all?"*; Are you quoting me or yourself? Because you're the only one who mentioned "winning". Also, regarding Theroux, have you noticed a common trend among his interview subjects? They seem so absorbed in their own work, so eager to be in the limelight, that they often reveal the flaws of their work? To be direct, are you upvoting yourself through alts, breaking Reddit rules? Your points seem oddly consistent here, and usually variances occur, along with people downvoting opposing viewpoints. Seems like I haven't been downvoted, consistently, other than my original post. Almost as if someone doesn't want the post to be seen, yet wants validation to their views within the post.]

The quotes are (obviously) to indicate that there is no such thing as winning in this context. How can you "win" a discussion? (You *must* have seen quotation marks used that way before, right? If not, consider it a new string to your bow.)

So, do *you* feel absorbed in your work? Are *you* keenly aware of the flaws in your thinking and in your approach? What to you think Louis Theroux would make of you? I think you are projecting your own ideas and self-image on his work (which is a *bit* more nuanced than you think, I think), and any idea you might have of yourself as a champion of rationality seems... unsupported by the evidence.

No alt accounts (really, do people bother to do that? care that much? it's just... an online forum!) but you did end up on the spam list because you were reported for trolling. Everyone's up for a discussion, but uninformed ranting is of no use to anyone. Was that neutral journalism in action? ;-)

[...]

> [OP: *'You do realise that "dimensional jumping" is a metaphor, right?'*; I suggest you add this to the sidebar.]

Relevant excerpts:

OVERVIEW - The essence of Dimensional Jumping is the leveraging of perspective-structuring metaphors and the techniques derived from them. It is for readers to decide for themselves through personal investigation and introspection whether jumping is appropriate for them or not. Never believe something without personal evidence; never dismiss something without personal evidence.

Note, however, that being "just" a metaphor doesn't mean it can't be used to accomplish things, specifically: reformatting your experience.

> [OP: Are you familiar with Louis Theroux? Also, when saying "personal" evidence, are you referring to anecdotal evidence?]

I am indeed familiar with Louis Theroux.

I'm referring to trying something out for yourself, to see whether it provides your with a particular subjective experience. I'm not sure what your point is there? You'd be better off speaking more directly.

To emphasise: the subreddit (as far as I'm concerned; I didn't originate it) isn't promoting a particular worldview as true. It's saying: here's a model of experience (basically a modified subjective idealist view) that's interesting to explore, you can check it out by investigating it yourself.

> [OP: "I am indeed familiar with Louis Theroux."; How do you think he would react to your sub and the discussions you've had regarding it? (not just with me, but with others) All documented and archived on Reddit? Do you feel a personal sense of affinity towards Mr. Theroux or more towards his various guests in interviews? Also, do you think most of your readers actually believe that your "exercises" are metaphors? It seems like the posts made by those whom seem to not think that this is not a metaphor aren't reminded of the metaphor part. Do your replies to them address this phenomena? Also, when did you first create these exercises?]

Sorry, what *exactly* is the point of this exchange, if you're not actually going to have a discussion or state your own position? It's not that complicated: The subreddit itself started (before my time) with some sort of mirror ritual reminiscent of /r/threekings. Gradually it's morphed into an exploration of the potential use of the philosophical idealist (or non-dualist) viewpoint + formatting metaphors, to make changes in your experience, and to examine the nature of the subjective experience more closely.

> [OP: *"Sorry, what exactly is the point of this exchange, if you're not actually going to have a discussion or state your own position?"*; To give you a chance to explain you sub, of course! Also, to ask the questions which the public may ask when stumbling across your sub. Although why are you asking me this now? I know you didn't feel threatened a few seconds ago, but do you feel threatened now? You seemed defensive towards the very beginning. Why is it that whenever you change the subject, a few of my questions go unanswered? My questions are very direct and I aim to emulate Louis Theroux's neutrality. Care to answer the questions you've avoided, or shall I aggregate them into a list?]

I think perhaps you have not been paying attention to Louis Theroux very closely! I've been a fan of his since his work on Michael Moore's *TV Nation*. Good interview with him in *The Guardian* earlier this year:

> "No, I go in to tell stories, to reveal the truth and to try to understand. Not to set people straight," he says. "I don't go into this with the agenda of saving the world."
>
> *-- Louis Theroux: 'My secret fear is that I'm not helping'*

He takes a neutral stance and seeks to understand and explore a topic on its own terms, from the inside. He does not actually take satirical or mocking stance in his documentaries. Furthermore, he doesn't make barbed comments and then re-edit them. (Seriously, what was all that "never graduated from school" shit earlier?)

So, are you imagining you are conducting an interview or an investigation? Perhaps you feel you are performing a public service of some sort? Are you fantasising or roleplaying about being an "online Louis"? Because if you really wanted to do that, the correct approach would be to engage and fully understand it on its own terms. So, personally I don't really identify with a particular position - I think ways of thinking are useful or they are not. I aim to keep separate the experiences or observations, and the conceptual frameworks or "connective fictions" which we use to explain them to ourselves. Do *you* identify with a particular position, as being *true*? What it seems you are trying to do is "debunk" the subject of this subreddit. Which seems a bit pointless to me, and the equivalent of trying to debunk a diagram or disprove the subjective experience of seeing colours.

> [OP: You know that to keep one's status as journalist, one must state neutrality, correct? It seems like you understood Theroux's statement, yet didn't understand why he made that statement. As for the rest of your points, I'll address them *after* you address the questions which you've avoided answering.]

So are you suggesting that a journalist should *state* neutrality, whilst *actually* pushing an agenda? ;-)

That seems to be your approach anyway, perhaps unwittingly. Also, I may be wrong (forgive me if that is so), but you strike me as being one of those people who is perhaps really into popular science (but never actually studied it or the philosophy of science). That's okay, but often such people tend to be "defenders of the true worldview" rather than actually of a scientific mindset. With that in mind, exchanging question is pointless, since we aren't going to be exploring a subject - you are going to be seeking opportunities to "win" an argument which only you are having, so that you can once again feel comfortable with the set of ideas you have become identified with.

> [OP: *"So are you suggesting that a journalist should state neutrality, whilst actually pushing an agenda?;-)"*; You are mistaken (again, I wonder if you are trying to keep this discussion unfocused), I'm pointing out that your comments have shown that you don't understand that journalists do need

to maintain neutrality to be considered journalists, yet it is common practice to push an agenda. Why the winks? Do you think you're being witty?

"That seems to be your approach anyway, perhaps unwittingly."; Things may not always seem as they... uh... seem? Ironic, you use the word "unwittingly" as you delve deeper into... your "thing"

You still have not answered many of my more important questions, often opting to misinterpret and keep the discussion unfocused. I ask you this one again, though: When exactly did you first come up with your "exercises"?]

Well, if you have an agenda, let's hear all about it! Then we can have a proper discussion. Because at the moment *it isn't actually a discussion*. And it certainly isn't journalism either, if that's the fantasy you are holding onto, given your comments so far. It's just non-constructive trolling, which is of no benefit to anyone.

Aside: What you are referring to above isn't journalism, not even advocacy journalism - it's *propaganda*.

[OP: Are you familiar with James Randi? Also, what makes you think I'm coming from a journalistic angle, didn't you forget our talk about satire, son? *creepywink!*;-)

"if that's the fantasy you are holding onto, given your comments so far."; Looks like your subconscious might be taking my points to heart, and expressing itself without your control. You might need to jump again.]

Randi, yeah what a joke. He's set skepticism back decades, in my opinion. :-/

[OP: Literally laughed at you. As much as you try to keep an aura of level-headed kindness, you will definitely refer to people as a "joke" when put into a corner. You are a joke. You are not helping anyone. I don't need to be fake like you in an attempt at bravado/preserving non-existent integrity. Explain how he set skepticism back by decades. Also explain how skepticism relates to this sub and to how you should act when people don't realize this is a metaphor. Maybe I should email him and explain our correspondence? He's been on Reddit before. #creepywink ;-) Maybe I should also contact anonymous, to confirm if you are trying to make money off this quackery. Anon is busy at the moment, so I'll give you a chance at redeeming yourself. Also, are you promoting other websites or paid-for services? Are you a failed Psychologist attempting to be a Parapsychologist?

"Some within the parapsychology community were outraged, with Dr. Berthold Schwarz (R.I.P. QUACK) declaring: **"Randi has set parapsychology back 100 years!"** Randi's approach also raised outcries concerning ethical considerations and doubts about positive effects on methodology awareness,[13] both within the parapsychology and the skeptic communities. But Randi reports that other parapsychology researchers have contacted him with praise, describing the project as "splendid and deserved", "an important sanitary service", "commendable", and "long-needed"."

The reason I brought up Theroux is because his subjects for interview are often so self-absorbed and pathetic, along with being arrogant and fake, thinking they can fool the masses... that they dig their own grave and become the subject of ridicule for normal society at large. Especially among scientists, doctors, journalists and others who are doing the *real* hard work in advancing science and medicine. The ones that didn't flunk out of med school and start a website to promote on Reddit.]

Last comment on this thread - let's keep it to the new one you started.

Although Randi did entertaining work in his reveals of magician's tricks used in public claims of "supernatural powers" (for instance, Uri Gellar and James Hydrick), he is a showman and magician, he was not proceeding as a rational thinker, and I don't think he ever intended to. He is not a useful model for skeptical thought, except in the sense of not adopting views without satisfying yourself of their worth. He also comes with a lot of baggage due to legal stuff. (I think Randi has retired now, has he not?)

As regards this subreddit - read the sidebar. The foundation of it is a questioning attitude and that nothing should be taken as fact without personal exploration. Actually, the underlying idea is that the only things you can be certain of are:

1. That you exist.
2. That you are having experiences.

A skeptical attitude should be adopted for everything beyond that, when it comes to interpreting those experiences. In other words, you should separate out the *experience* from the *explanation*, and recognise that all explanations are connective fictions, to be adopted or not depending on their usefulness.

I'm not promoting anything at all, here or elsewhere. And if someone was going to do it based on this subreddit, I'm not quite sure how exactly they'd set up a paid-for service based on "don't believe anything" and "don't take anyone's word for things" and "these are metaphors". Maybe they could sell subreddit-branded water glasses? ;-)

EDIT: *So, you later added all the stuff from "Are you a failed Psychologist..." onwards...*

Ah, you seem to think this is some sort of paranormal thing? Which just shows you still don't understand it. You also seem to be viewing this subreddit as some big deal, whereas to everyone else it's just a tiny inconsequential online forum, on a massive website, on a massive internet.

Look, I get that you have your favourite role-models, and you have a particular worldview, but you're missing the mark here. So, a few of mine would be George Ellis, David Bohm and Paul Feyerabend. Have you actually read physics or philosophy, or are you just a "defender" of a vague notion of those subjects? Holding up James Randi and Louis Theroux (fine folk though they may be) as your primary champions doesn't seem, I dunno, very convincing somehow. You're basically just ranting here, now.

[...]

[[OP:

> Why are you so upset?... You edited...

No I didn't you must have been in another dimension where I did.

.....**You sound like someone who... probably hasn't thought about things very much.**

Wait, I thought I was the one in this dimension that was using personal attacks and insults. Why would you do such a thing, oh enlightened leader who isn't a scam artist looking for attention on the internet while spouting self-help quackery which could be dangerous to anyone who actually wishes to improve themselves?]]

Self improvement? Exploration of experiencing, maybe.

Heh, well we've had fun here, haven't we? I think you got a bit caught up in the "dimensional jumping" metaphor, rather than the underlying thing (which is really more like: adopt a philosophical idealist view and from there explore the "patterning" nature of experience though experimentation). Thanks for engaging! ;-)

Reply to “How many of you know that this is just a metaphor and not a substitute for Science-based medicine and counseling? If anyone tries to sell you anything, don't buy it. It is a scam.”

Discuss! I think the poster doubts this subreddit's ability to think rationally, entertain ideas, and make choices. I also think that he misunderstands the whole thing. But perhaps that isn't for me to say.

For completeness, I should mention that OP's post seems to be a follow-on from his earlier post over at /r/skeptic. There's actually another post over there at the moment which is a quote from Steven Novella on skepticism, and it's worth reading that in full even though it's on a particular topic. See below:

> "The skeptical outlook is to consciously remove oneself from any emotional investment in any particular belief. Instead we align our identity with the process of science, listening to facts, and following valid logic and sound arguments.
>
> Part of this is being transparent and engaging intellectually with others. The critical analysis of others will keep us honest. We must be our own harshest skeptic, for if not others will expose any flaws in our process. We will then be under pressure to examine our methods and change our conclusions if necessary. Essentially being a skeptic and being part of a community of skeptics harnesses inherent human psychology toward being logical and scientific, rather than irrational and emotional.
>
> As a skeptic my primary motivation is getting it right (not defending any particular position), and if I don’t I know that other skeptics will point out my error, and if I don’t properly engage with their criticism, or if I dig in my heels, I will lose credibility."
>
> *-- Excerpt from Steven Novella article*

The poster then adds:

> “I think this is what sets skepticism apart from other -isms. Unlike political ideologies or religions or other belief-systems, it focuses on methods for finding out, not on particular conclusions and beliefs. Which I think is its greatest strength.”

Good stuff and good comments in response. Although one should obviously approach even skepticism-related material with a healthy dose of skepticism, however...

[...]

It might be helpful if you maybe bring up what specific ideas you *do* support, otherwise there's no discussion here, just name-calling. As a recent post elsewhere highlights:

> "There is nothing more anathema to the skeptical perspective than an individual who seeks doubt, rather than knowledge, who dismisses wholesale when engaging in detail, who discounts counterpoints out of hand, or who is utterly convinced that they have all the knowledge they'll ever need to make a conclusion about an issue."

So, some of the ideas behind this subreddit are captured in Berkeley's philosophical idealism, and offshoots such as the Many-Minds interpretation and the QBism intepretation of quantum theory. The "what if?" scenario being explored is: if you take philosophical idealism (or: nondualism) as your starting point, beginning with only what you *definitely* know from direct experience, how could you build out from there in terms of exploring the nature of experience? Specifically, in what way do the metaphors we adopt and the intentional acts we perform influence the content of our experiences - be they derived from philosophical or scientific concerns or just everyday narrative?

[...]

> OP (AthleticsTix): Were you ever forced to pop pills? I'm a supporter of CBT, not meds.

It's interesting that you support CBT specifically though, since its current dominance is not uncontroversial. It's been suggested that its apparent popularity, like that of medication, might have more to do with organisational convenience than it having an accurate model that works reliably for *solving* problems (rather than helping *endure* them). It's currently being pushed as a blanket solution in some countries, when that is not really justified I feel, based on the depth of its model and the evidence to date.

See psychoanalyst Darian Leader's article, *A quick fix for the soul*, for an accessible read on this, and cognitive neuropsychologist Keith Laws on *Has cognitive behavioural therapy for psychosis been oversold?* for more serious coverage.

As always, if someone finds something useful then great, and one should try all reasonable avenues and that includes CBT. And of course, there is a difference between having developed poor thinking habits *vs* having developed deep depression or hallucinations! But we should be wary of hand-waving promises which are sometimes motivated by political and economic reasoning rather than scientific or intellectual integrity - which I think is often the case with this. Y'know, be properly skeptical and do our own research. (As I'm sure you do.)

[...]

> All as a metaphor, though.

Well, *all* explanations are effectively metaphors. What matters is how useful they are, how well their predictions correspond to experience. I hope you haven't developed the bad habit of thinking that stuff like "gravitational fields" are real things? Or if they are, in *what sense* are they real things?

> When this is an individual "exercise" being pushed on vulnerable people.

Who's pushing what? Now, I don't whether you or someone you care for has had some bad encounter with a cult or something - you seem pretty focused on this notion - and if that is so then you have my sympathy. But you do seem to be reading this subreddit from some pretty odd assumptions - assumptions nobody else seems to be making (probably because they read the sidebar before going all straw man on things). And what's more, you are then ranting instead of actually discussing or making a coherent argument. Which is ironic, since you originally posted your comment in /r/skeptic. Obviously, the paranoia about alts isn't helping (which I can assure you isn't the case, although I realise that won't help).

Anyway, this thread here is your own special thread to engage with. Lay it all out, and people can judge your input as they see fit, and make their own conclusions from the responses you give them.

But you really *should* lay out exactly what you think the topic of this subreddit is, and what is problematic about that. If you can't do the first of these, then you're not really saying anything at all, because you quite literally don't know what you're talking about.

> I truly pity you

How can you be sure of that? ;-)

[...]

Your obsession with Louis Theroux and James Randi is really odd. Especially since you seem to misunderstand the first (he is not on the mission you think him to be, and he is a journalist-entertainer really), and have an elevated impression of the second (with no scientific credentials and a history of untrustworthiness, he is only qualified to 'debunk' illusionists, as a skeptic-entertainer). Why those two? If you are on the skeptic/rationalist path there are better figures to follow, if following people is your thing, which it seems to be. I'm not sure what the real reason is that you "speak out", but since it mostly consists of random disconnected points, and there's no coherent argument even vaguely related to, for instance, the topic of this subreddit, it's unlikely you are going to help anyone by doing it. Your comments here and elsewhere consist of an antagonistic stream of uninformed ranting, personal attacks, non-sequiters involving the words "Theroux" and "Randi", and even paranoid delusions. I seriously hope nobody who *is* vulnerable ends up anywhere on your radar, the unfortunate target for your emotional release.

Everyone is polite in response, of course, because it is natural to feel sympathy once the initial amusement has faded, but I have to wonder - if this is how you respond to a bit of playful experimental metaphysics, who knows how you'd respond if you took the time to do some actual reading in science and philosophy and inform yourself about things - maybe even find out about proper skepticism - rather than watching media personalities! It's meant to be all about having dialogues, don't you know.

(Yeah, I realise you're not actually interested in being serious, but it's become interesting to watch you dodge the content of people's comments and post disconnected sentences in response, claiming victory in an argument nobody's having except you.)

> [OP: Proof that you are narcissistic to the point of thinking you are a doctor. Once again projecting your avoidance, quackery and hypocrisy. So how old are you and when did you make up these exercises? Are you a metaphyscicist, doctor or philosopher? Where are your credentials? Do you accept responsibility if you mislead anyone or caused anyone to avoid real medicine, science and philosophy? Do you pm people who subscribe here, offering advice and counseling without credentials? How many alts do you have on here? How does the bullshit here relate to the other subs you mod? What is your job outside of reddit? Seems like philosophy and science are merely excuses for your lack of credentials. Do you see any long terms risks for those who might be misled and consume your quackery?]

Okay, so you still don't get it, even now. And so you can't actually discuss the topic or criticise it on its own terms (which would be fun), because you don't actually know what you are attacking. Hence your own ignoring of any of the points people raise during the discussion.

There is nothing very new or controversial there, in terms of philosophical ideas; they are not new concepts. The only addition is exploring of the implications of it, by experiment. What one then does with that, and what one uses as the subject, is up to the individual - as are the conclusions one draws.

Fundamentally, the problem here might be that you are just not an abstract thinker. Everyone else seems to get it, except you, since you seem to have brought some sort of strange template with you and overlaid it upon everything. *You are applying a delusional idea of what this subreddit is, to what's basically discussion forum with a (potentially practical) philosophical theme.*

Meanwhile, of course I'm not going to start giving out personal info, especially not to someone like yourself. For your curiosity: my background is in science and technology - but *that is not relevant here*, because this is a discussion forum about exploring a particular set of ideas to see where they lead, to be taken on their own merits.

It is not relevant because: the whole thrust of this subreddit is the idea that people make judgements based on their own experiences no matter what the topic, applying their own thinking, and not on what anyone says. That means me *or* you *or* any authority figure, regardless of their credentials. It's actually a concern to me that you elevate the people you do, and are advocating others use them as their baseline for truth. Everyone is just people; including prominent figures in religion, science, philosophy, sociology; even journalist-entertainers, skeptic-entertainers, etc. For instance, eugenics was practiced in the USA until WW2 (it was actually the template for the Nazi program), including the passage of compulsory sterilisation laws, and was accepted as fact and taught in universities across the country. It was seen as scientifically validated. Prominent figures of authority advocated it. Would you have been defending that at the time? Given your tenuous knowledge and tendency to follow, I suspect so! (Okay, I'm just having a bit of fun with you there.)

You've got me curious though: What makes you think people are posting under alts? Where do you get the idea that anyone advocates the avoidance of science, medicine and philosophy? Why are you so obsessed with me in particular? Are you under the impression that being a moderator = agreement with all comments? And again: what *exactly* do you think the topic of this subreddit is, given that your comments don't seem to match up to it?

(Man, I just couldn't resist replying; too fascinating.)

[[OP:

> Okay, so you still don't get it, even now.

Redundant. Also, what is "it"? Insane amounts of projection as usual... let's see what the walking fallacy has for me today. Noticed you didn't answer any of my questions. Again. For the Seventh time. What are you hiding? Are you afraid that certain questions might reveal facts about you which would turn vulnerable people away from being taken advantage of by you to satiate your messiah complex?

> > For instance, eugenics was practiced in the USA until WW2 (it was actually the template for the Nazi program), including the passage of compulsory sterilisation laws, and was accepted as fact and taught in universities across the country. It was seen as scientifically validated.

Wow, I think you've covered every fallacy. The complied list of unanswered questions and fallacies you've committed is going to be amazing.

> (Man, I just couldn't resist replying; too fascinating.)

What's fascinating? Attempting to belittle someone, but actually making yourself look like a spineless douche?

> Are you under the impression that being a moderator = agreement with all comments?

All it takes is time to get a megalomaniac to reveal themselves as mentally ill. No particular diagnosis, I'm unqualified.

> Why are you so obsessed with me in particular?

lol. You flatter yourself and at the same time attempt to belittle me, yet another beautiful unwitting microcosm you create of this overall dialogue. I'm guessing Randi and Theroux (my other obsessions, correct? Because I've spoken about them to you only in this sub for less than a month.)

If you've been speaking about your quackery and yourself for longer, according to your logic are you not obsessed with *yourself*? Not only are you a blowhard and one who seeks to validate themselves with buzzwords, but you are a misleading coward and science (along with actual philosophy) fundamentally are not compatible with your self-centered wannabe cult guidance.

Richard Dawkins. Opinions?]]

In this thread and the initial one, in your responses to myself and others, *all* you've done is attempt to attack the commenter, and appeal to authority, rather than engage with the topic. You have been content-free throughout. In fact, I don't think you've responded to *any* point or presented *any* view. I guess that's one way to avoid making a fallacious argument - never make an argument at all. :-)

I suppose you are trying to go for the "discredit the author" route, following what you perceive to be the Theroux-Randi™ template. But what would that achieve, with me or anyone else? It would leave the actual ideas intact, to be taken on their own merit (or lack of, as the reader saw fit). Ideas which predate this subreddit, a subreddit which emphasises thinking for yourself, and taking nothing on trust.

Perhaps you do not understand what is being discussed, and so *can't* participate. Have you even read Berkeley yet? Perhaps this is just an emotional release for you, a need to "win" no matter whether it makes sense or not. In other words, for you this is about your very identity, and that's why you are showing signs of paranoia and hysteria. (I say this from a layman's point of view of course; I am not a medical doctor.) Nobody needs to belittle you; at the moment you have effectively dismissed yourself with your approach.

Richard Dawkins - He was an excellent biologist, then a mediocre philosopher, and now he's a poor social commentator. Why are you letting yourself be distracted by these media figures who are presented as "crusaders"? You are just wasting time that would be better spent focusing on reading deeply, exploring ideas, and thinking for yourself.

Or if this is not actually about the ideas at all...

On the other hand, perhaps your concern has nothing to do with science and philosophy as such - rather, you are worried that broader society might be going in a direction you don't like. Religion's influence in politics, non-evidence-based approaches to policy, that sort of thing. With that I have sympathy. But it would be a mistake, I say, to think that replacing all the god-believers or new-age-followers with scientists and engineers

would transform things for the better necessarily. After all, in theory all the Christians in the US and other institutions should have been working for the wellbeing of their fellow man; that's not how it has played out though. With a completely amoral structure in place based on logical reasoning and scientific modelling, we might *make decisions better*, but we won't necessarily *make better decisions*.

So, it would make things more *efficient*, perhaps, but the political goals probably wouldn't change; the country's control infrastructure would remain nearly identical, it's just the methods that would shift. We might ultimately end up with something like a technocracy (in the original sense):

> "The term technocracy was originally used to advocate the application of the scientific method to solving social problems. According to the proponents of this concept, the role of money, economic values, and moralistic control mechanisms would be eliminated altogether if and when this form of social control should ever be implemented in a continental area endowed with enough natural resources, technically trained personnel, and installed industrial equipment. In such an arrangement, concern would be given to sustainability within the resource base, instead of monetary profitability, so as to ensure continued operation of all social-industrial functions into the indefinite future. Technical and leadership skills would be selected on the basis of specialized knowledge and performance, rather than democratic election by those without such knowledge or skill deemed necessary."

In fact, in the UK there have already been moves towards this with the Behavioural Insights Team - see recent article in *Wired*, which asks "who nudges the nudgers?" - which one might see as the natural evolution of Edward Bernay's work on population management, and extending the remit of ongoing data collection from being specific to anti-terrorism and serious crime, to now include "economic wellbeing". Similar data and analysis projects are running in many countries, dating back to the early 2000s and TIA, so this is the way things are going eventually, I'd say.

All of which makes logical sense of course: it's *obviously* more efficient to get everything integrated into databases and set up automated rules and alerts, with algorithms designed by "nudging" teams, in alignment with the policies of government and associated agencies. So if you wait a while, all this stuff about people believing in things you view as foolish might not matter - personal beliefs will eventually no longer be able to have much influence over behaviour in a social and economic context anyway.

You know, if that *is* your bag, if you are concerned about science *vs* woo and how beliefs affect how things are run, then you might really enjoy reading some Paul Feyerabend, such as *Farewell to Reason*, which explores the relationship between how science is actually conducted, and society at large. Even if you disagree with him on many points, and it's likely you will, it is still very thought-provoking and great for clarifying your own views.

> > Discredit the "author"? You wrote a few paragraphs, posted them on reddit and promoted the shit out of it with alts.

Ha, I really meant it more as a general term rather than a personal reference, although we shouldn't give reddit any ideas: it'll start advertising itself as the home of "100 million published authors" before we know it...

> > Skuuuuurt! Redirect!

It was a sincere change of tack to see where you were coming from, actually, which is why I bolded it.

And there are genuine concerns here, I feel, about what is accepted without skepticism by the population at large (this applies as much to science, psychology, medicine as 'woo', perhaps more so) and then applied as political or economic solutions. Science is amoral, I'd say, but in the political sphere science and technology are being treated as inherently good, which circumvents our ability to apply critical thinking to things. The frustration I *feel* about the misuse of knowledge and the misrepresentation of science and philosophy as processes and conceptual frameworks is similar to how you expressed your side of our discussion; I just dial it back.

> In the end, I do apologize if I attacked your character. Only if you aren't using alts to promote this site/vote manipulate/etc.

No problem - apologies if I've been a little too "provocative" sometimes. Yeah, there's really not alts or voting stuff going on here (not by me anyway). It would kinda ruin the point, which is to have people explore a certain philosophical perspective, without actually having bought into it. The sidebar really does lay it out: it's taking philosophical idealism as the starting point, and exploring how actively adopting metaphors "patterns" experience and filters intention, and seeing what the effects are, without presuming anything. It tries to be "worldview-free" other than a basic notion that experience can be described as a dumb patterning system. The beneficial aspect of any outcomes are (useful?) side-effects really.

> I see a huge danger in an "exercise" that requires the practitioner to at least somewhat accept some form of fallacy in their life.

It's something to be cautious of, definitely. The exercise itself tries to completely avoid suggesting either the nature of the exercise, or the type of outcome - while warning not to treat it lightly (because you do tend to get some sort of result, even if we interpret that as apparent coincidences and selective perception). In other words, to avoid any tendency to fallacy. It's a bit of a double-edged sword, this, because of course despite the intention to prevent it, people inevitably bring their *own* worldviews to it.

> *[replacing all the god-believers or new-age-followers with scientists and engineers]* Another introspective piece into your emotions. You feel threatened by me. I don't want you replaced, I just want you to be more responsible.

Actually, I was putting myself on the side of the scientists and engineers there! *Anyway,* some good has come of our exchange, because it's resurrected the discussion about the subreddit's name and all its baggage (which is historical accident - it really did begin as that mirror technique thing before it gradually morphed into this), and the idea of having one that's more appropriate to the actual topic, of which "dimensional jumping" is just the most provocative metaphor.

> Now I'm convinced that you are an AI running a Behavioural Insights exercise on Reddit.

Haha, rumbled! :-)

> Thank you for engaging in dialogue and not banning me. Thank you for offering at least some of your material ,which some people find to be great, for free.

Without dialogue across boundaries, we're fucked I'd say, so it's all good.

Well, if people find it useful that's great, but to be honest it's just me exploring my thoughts on a certain angle; I'd be bemused if someone actually wanted to pay for it, considering they can just browse reddit while sipping a glass of water instead... :-)

Cheers. (That was classic Wesley by the way.)

[...]

> You are conscious in this moment right here, would you not agree?

I don't think we're conscious *in the moment* though? The moment is not the container!

Rather it's that consciousness is eternal and is the boundless container for all moments. The [sensory] moment arises within *it*. This means that the centuries never pass in time. Instead it is *we* - as time, as consciousness - that pass across the centuries. So perhaps: conscious *of* this moment. Better: conscious *as* this moment?

So, yes, non-formally and without having to go into details, anyone can confirm for themselves the undeniable fact that "I am conscious, right now" - simply by pausing and noticing. And really, from that observation the whole perspective follows naturally, if one stays with it as one works through things.

[...]

Yeah, the sub's naming is a historical accident really, as reflected in the intro post. Initially it wasn't really "about" what it's become about - that is, having fun exploring the nature of experience for curiosity and utility - and although it's a quirky and provocative name, it does make the initial impression misleading for the casual reader (or the skeptic who isn't a skeptic and is looking for a fight). But on the other hand perhaps a strong and engaging image gets people thinking in a way that a more dry or abstract presentation would not.

At its core, we're talking about the ultimate skepticism: identify exactly what you are sure of, treat that and only that as *fundamentally* true, and absolutely everything else as only *relatively* true. And what you are certain of is one thing, although it is more easily stated in two parts:

1. That you exist (you are aware).
2. That you are having an experience (you are aware of content).

Anything beyond that is about the content of experience, and is up for grabs, and we treat all descriptions of that as provisional, as a convenient or useful or interesting or *fun* fiction only. (*Note* - It is useful to assert a basic level of form to experience though, and say that by default we are an "open aware perceptual space" in which experiences arise, or which "takes on the shape of" experiences. This gives us a ground or reference point for discussion and exploration.)

For instance, take the assumption that "the world" is of the same format as our experience. Although our experiences may arise in the form of a 3D-formatted spatial scene, that doesn't mean "the world" is of that format, that is it a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time". Unfortunately though, our thoughts are *also* formatted in this way (they are experiences too) so it's not really possible to think beyond this. However, we can certainly take the most generalised version of structure - we can talk of "the patterning of experience" - and, bearing this in mind, at least avoid committing to conceptual frameworks and forgetting that they are "connective fictions" only.

The working model for this is to provisionally treat the world as a dimensionless "infinite gloop" from which experiences are selected, in a manner perhaps comparable to scanning our attention around a 3-dimensional room. Our investigations, then, might be said to be about exploring the nature of the "selection mechanism" and its limits. Those limits, that basic and unalterable formatting, would, if reached, be the structure of the "underlying substrate" of experience, effectively a combination of the structuring of "mind" and "world" (one can't separate the two out). However, if no such limit was reached, then we would have to infer that there *is* no fixed underlying substate, and the patterning of experience is just that: accumulated habitual patterns which are subject to change.

Of course, we could never make a final conclusion here. But that's okay, because this is *really* about freedom of thought and being skeptical of *all* narrative structures, based on (looping back round here) the recognition of the difference between fundamental and relative truth.

Next up - Our exciting new range of Owls of Eternity™ branded apparel! (8>)=

[...]

> [A: Hey, I can actually see where you're coming from. But you don't have to be concerned, because this sub is not promoting a single thing besides: here's a way to investigate the nature of experience, see what happens (if you want). You can take it or leave it. It's an online discussion forum. You can't seriously think the mods are trying to sell stuff via PM.. There is literally nothing to buy, besides maybe some cups haha!]

Although perhaps we could do a sponsorship deal with Volvic or Evian, haha! :-)

> [A: New Dimensional Jumping cups with OLED displays so you never have to worry about sticking and removing labels off your cups again! Just pair your cups through the Dimensional Jumping Cup app via bluetooth. Upgrade to the premium version of the app for $5.00 to customize the color of your text and get an unlimited amount of scrolling text to boost your desired changes!
>
> If you buy it today we'll throw in a free mirror.]

Small Print - Voltage compatibility with target dimension is not guaranteed. Bluetooth pairing may fail in dimensions where teeth are not blue. Financing arrangements are subject to inter-dimensional tarriffs. Accessing reconditioned dimensions may lead to memory corruption and deja vu. And deja vu.

Reply to “Holy. Crap. Two Glasses Works...I Think. TV Show Changed Network.”

> [Q1: Oddly enough, I was a huge skeptic of this. I did the experiment a week ago and 2 different shows I've watched for many years are now on a new station. My result hasn't come yet, but when I first noticed this change it was very odd.]
>
> [Q2 (AthleticsTix): Correlation does not equal causation. To assign a causal relation to the data is simply a fallacy. Just know that you are being vulnerable, and people will attempt to take advantage of that.]

An excellent point. Causation is an aspect of a particular description, and not of any set of observations. It is an interpretation. More importantly, the road from coincidence to correlation is a long one. If the aim is to discover more about how the world apparently works and codify it, then repeating an experiment is the only way to discount confirmation bias and the like, and avoid the temptation to attribute every change to a previous act. Replicate the results!

> > You should be a politician. Maybe write for Donald Trump. You'd kill it. You'd have to teach him your godlike redirection skills, though.

Well, you made a decent point but, since it was a bit of of buzzword phrasing which might not mean a lot out of context - i.e. causality in the sense of physics or philosophy or common use? - I thought I'd add some. It matters whether we are treating "cause" as in the sense of an inherent relation, or part of an explanation:

> ‘In physics it is helpful to interpret certain terms of a physical theory as causes and other terms as effects... For different physical theories the notions of cause and effect may be different... So what constitutes a "cause" and what constitutes an "effect" depends on the total system of explanation in which the putative causal sequence is embedded.’
>
> -- Wikipedia: *Causality (physics)*

As for the rest, not everyone spends their time viewing things in terms of a battle or political argument, you know. Some people are just interested in exploring ideas with other curious people (minus the snark).

> [Q3: Is it possible to get someone banned from a subreddit? This fellow (AthleticsTix) has been quite the nuisance recently.]

Apart from this little exchange, his participation has recently been limited to the two threads he began. And those threads are now closed, as far as I'm concerned. I felt I should at least see those discussions through, just to allow a contrary - even antagonistic - position to play out, and allow people to make their own judgements.

> [Q3: It isn't dissent or a differing of opinion that I mind, but the antagonism is a bit jarring, you know? There's a bunch of people exchanging and comparing ideas, discussing how they're different and similar and encouraging each other to experiment, and then there's one asshole just standing around shouting that all the rest are idiots, you know? Basically I generally view this sub as a library, where people are free to exchange ideas in peace, and this guy is the guy who's being loud and distracting everyone.]

Yeah, I completely agree. Differing views are (more than) fine, that's part of sharing our insights; fighting to "win" without actually contributing, is not. People who do that and get reported end up on the spam list for pre-approval. I let that one run a bit in his own thread because he'd done a cross post to /r/skeptic, and it gave folk an opportunity to voice their own "meta" view on the subreddit, if desired. Normally the mods wouldn't let that stuff run.

Reply to “/u/Kazymir told me to stay off this sub...”

The idea here is that people can take it or leave it: do the experiments and see what happens, or not. There's no debate or opinion to be had. There's no worldview being pushed; except try stuff see if it works or not. If it's not for you, nothing is lost, except a bit of time, which was probably going to be spent in bed or in front of the TV anyway.

Think of it as a practical /r/Glitch_in_the_Matrix or /r/Occult centred around a particularly powerful active metaphor built on the philosophical concept of Idealism.

> If it's just a kind of metaphor that's nice. People can use it to have fun and relax their mind. But people in here are actually talking about literally jumping dimensions. So this isn't a metaphor anymore. They're lying so much nonsense that it literally hurts my brain. I dont understand how people can be so stupid to believe in this bullshit.

It's a metaphor to trigger a genuine effect. The "dimensions" imagery does get confusing; it would be better to say something like "state jumping" or "format shifting". But then you have to talk about the structuring of mind and conscious experience.

Changes *are* experienced. The nature of those changes, that's something else. It is easier to do just by having a go. But note that nobody's pushing it here - "there's an interesting phenomenon, you might be able to leverage it, up to you".

> They aren't real the people just think they are.

Hmm, how do you tell the difference? If something was one way but is now another way, if a prior event seems now not to have happened, is that not "actually real"? Or do you mean like "in a real way beyond our sensory experience"? Not sure what you mean by placebo and biases. What's the mechanism behind those?

> The Placebo Effect is a scientific proven effect, that you believe to actually feel a change, even though there is none.

That is *not* what the placebo effect is. The placebo effect is a *genuine change* which occurs despite there being no mechanistic cause for it. Many good studies. To repeat, the placebo effect means an "actual" result. That's why people are interested in studying it!

> Biases is very general meant.

You are reaching for something like "confirmation bias" here, I suppose? That certainly occurs. Here though, we are talking about something a little different. Hmm. I think you have mixed some things up here: hypnosis, confirmation bias, placebo effect, sensory experience, the concept of "the real". But it comes down to something quite simple: if you experience something, and your experience remains consistent with it afterwards and doesn't revert, in what way is that not "real"?

So like you said i mean the "in a real way beyond our sensory experience" - real.

There *is* no "real" beyond sensory experience. Our consistent, intersubjective sensory experience is *exactly* what we call real. Anything else is... imagination. Imagining that there is something else beyond what you are experiencing - a world we can never reach that is "how it really is". Now that *is* fantasy!

What is a headache except for the sensation of an ache in the head area? If that sensation goes away, then your headache has been solved.

This is very important generally:

- Not having an *explanation* for something doesn't mean it isn't a real *phenomenon*.
- Not *understanding* something does not mean it doesn't happen.

If we don't accept that, then science wouldn't get anywhere, because fresh observations usually *don't* have models to back them up. (In fact, the story of science has often been about resisting new discoveries because they can't yet be accounted for, but that is a different conversation.)

Placebo Effect

> That's what i meant that nothing changed. You NEVER got a medicine that helped, your mind just tricked you and by tricking yourself it surprisingly helped.

Perhaps this is a language issue! Something did change. Your body did change. We agree on this, right? What you are trying to say is maybe: "expecting that something is going to happen gives the same result as doing something which is supposed to make it happen". Of course, perhaps all pills are placebo-based. Perhaps they don't really do much of anything anyway. Perhaps all medicine is "pretend" to some extent - whether because the doctor believes in it, or the patient believes in it. Maybe we should update our sentence to say: "one person expecting that something is going to happen gives the same result as another person expecting something is going to happen"... ;-)

After all, it does seem as though the truth wears off over time.

Science and The Real

> Anyone who says something changed and didn't revert afterwards is simply lying. That stuff never happened. I don't believe you because it's impossible and the possibility of it being impossible is 100% and scientists can prove that.

So you are saying:

- That even if someone has an experience of something changing, they are lying?
- And that scientists can prove something is impossible?
- And that scientists have or could design and implement a study which could examine this effect?

I suggest that all these statements are dubious or incorrect.

> There is a "real" beyond sensory experience. I know a lot define their sensory experience as real BUT you can't do that always. There are many sorts of real.

You are incorrect and you completely misunderstand what science is and what it can do. To repeat:

- Science makes observations *using the senses*.
- Science notices *regularities* in those observations.
- It picks out those observations which can be *easily repeated* by *different people*.

- It *gathers account*s from those different people.
- It then makes up stories - conceptual frameworks, models, metaphors - which connect the different observations, using the *imagination* of the scientist.
- Science = senses + imagination.

And that's why it works so well. It takes the common, repeatable, simplified aspects of experience and, with imaginative stories, makes powerful tools from them.

Scientific Proof

> >Anyone can scientifically prove that dimensional jumping doesn't exist. You can prove scientifically that it's impossible and definitely nonsense

Really? How... *exactly?* Meanwhile, do you believe that you are conscious and that you have thoughts? *Prove it*. (It's a good exercise to go through.)

I suggest that what underlies your post is *faith* and is completely unscientific. Particularly since you are using phrases like "the mind tricked you and by tricking yourself it surprisingly helped", as if it were an explanation of some sort..

My Brain Is Lying

> >And the people who believe to see or feel a change that didn't revert afterwards are either lying or their brain makes them believe that it's real (with their sensory experience) even though in reality it is not.

How *exactly* does this work? Are you not concerned that, right now, all the things you think are true are just "your brain tricking you and making you believe they are real"? That in fact, your experiences are just based on ideas you picked up and believed along the way, with no grounding in fact whatsoever? ;-)

[...]

The Placebo Effect

From the 2014 paper *Outsmarting the Placebo Effect* we have the following definition:

> 'The placebo effect—real improvement brought on by the expectation of receiving treatment—can offer significant relief for patients.'

To emphasise: The placebo effect is when *actual persistent change* occurs. The patient does not receive treatment but has the same outcome as if they did receive treatment.

What you have described is... something else. You are describing someone "feeling better" but not really being better. The placebo effect is when people *actually get better*. Otherwise it wouldn't be an effect worth commenting on at all! To emphasise again: The placebo effect is when *something actually does change* even though no active medicine was applied. It is *not* just about subjective experience. The mechanism is unknown, but a result is obtained without there being an apparent cause.

It is nothing to do with being "fooled". Unless it's the whole universe, reality itself, that is "fooled". Which would be good enough for most people, I'd say...

The Placebo Effect - Continued - Untricking

Right, I think we're getting clearer now, and I see where we're disagreeing. Here's my broad definition:

> 'The placebo effect is the phenomenon of someone's **symptoms** improving when they've only been given a dummy treatment, or even after they've just seen a doctor.'
>
> --*Clinical trials and medical research*, NHS UK

Would you agree with this? The reason I'm pushing for this is that it's not just "feeling better". Does that make sense? In other words, if there is a mechanism it is not simply, say, pain suppression. That's why I push back against the idea that you are being "fooled by your brain". Which is no explanation at all. If I were to offer an account of the placebo effect (the alleviation of *symptoms* by a non-active process) I would say it's to do with a "release" of some sort - an "allowing". I wouldn't say the brain is being tricked, so much as it is being *un*-tricked. Which *is* where a link comes in...

I'll try and dig this out, but there was a good study of back pain a while back. People would go to the doctor, complaining of pain, and they'd get scanned and there would be misshapen discs and so on. Operations would follow. However... people with the exact same apparent issues had no pain, no restriction. The deformations weren't actual causal to the pain; they were only being picked up because attention had been drawn to them. In the same way, I suspect that many "issues" are non-issues in fact. That the "causes" detected are often unrelated to the experience of the patient, and only being discovered because of the investigation that results from the complain. In other words, "placebo" is a matter of there not being much of an illness in the first place.

This is different to "healing" which is a whole other thing (it may be a matter of degree, however).

> > ...just like I did on the whole dimensional jump-thing.

We've likely lost focus here, so let's bring it back around: how does this related to dimensional jumping, in your view?

The Placebo Effect - Continued - Double Tricking!

Let's perhaps summarise the placebo effect as you have discussed it so far (because we really want to focus this on dimensional jumping). I think I didn't properly communicate my idea on "untricking" so we'll put that aside. Let's also put aside the negative placebo effect, to help us stay focused.

Taking into account your whole comment, you are saying:

- The placebo effect is when your brain "tricks you" into feeling better, when there is no apparent physical change. In this case we have (say) been experiencing pain, and after the placebo treatment that pain is no longer experienced.

  (I am putting aside that symptoms more generally are often alleviated, not just pain and the like. However, that's not important for our discussion.)

- Dimensional jumping is when someone imagines that the world has changed, but in fact it has not. If they think there is a visual change, they are crazy or fuzzy-headed.

  (I am putting aside the possibility that people are lying about their accounts.)

In both cases you are saying that the only possible thing that can happen is that we might "feel a bit different". Anything beyond that, and we are "tricked and wrong", no matter what our experiences are. That...

No matter what seems to happen,
we are tricked and wrong,
or not clear-thinking enough,
or mentally ill,
or lying.

Is that really your position? You have offered no mechanisms for "biases" and "placebo", so really the only explanations you are offering are illness or lying. It seems to me that you are *starting* from the position that all that can happen with regards to 'placebo' or to 'jumping' is that the brain can trick you into a feeling, or that you are wrong somehow. You are screaming "it can't be true! no matter what!". This is hardly an research-based approach...

If I could guarantee you an experience, an experience that was undeniably more than just "feeling" or "biases", an experience that was so obviously about the big world changing rather than just little you, the world *coming at you* with changes from the outside - would you take it? Do you like owls?

> Sorry man. I'm done talking to an uneducated guy who doesn't understand the basic knowledge that is taught at school and believes in Scientology and supernatual stuff that doesn't exist.

I read your other post. Not sure why you are talking about Scientology and the supernatural! Okay, quick summary response (I'm not talking about the subreddit topic here, this was all about science, perception and consciousness). Your problem is that your education in science, philosophy and metaphysics probably is stuck at high-school level. That's not a problem of course, but it does leave you in the position where you "do not know what you do not know". Most of the problems with our discussion was because you haven't really thought about these things properly and in depth. Things that seem "obvious" to you are actually not so when you look deeper into the details. In physics we have tackled lots of things (although we still don't have a good description of quantum mechanics other than "it's maths and it works"), but when it comes to explaining the mind we are basically right at the start. We are not as far along as reading popular science articles would have you believe.

I'll leave you with one final thought to ponder: Do you genuinely feel, right now, that your experience is made up of neurons? If you don't, that means there is a gap we need to find an explanation for. (There are actually *many* gaps like this in our explanations.)

[...]

You might want to adjust your tone a little in future, to a more respectful one. Sometimes when we think we are not understood or say that someone else is ignorant, it is actually our *own* lack of understanding and our *own* ignorance that is own show. This can later turn out to be an embarrassment for the commenter - especially on a public forum like this.

Reply to “I feel like there are fakes”

A few points:

- I wouldn't get hung up on the candles-and-mirror thing; that's just a method of detaching from the current sensory experience.
- Science cannot investigate subjective experience. That's not what it's for. Science is about identifying shared "observed regularities" and making connective stories about them. Science is *not* about "truth". It's about coming up with the best predictive model for a particular phenomenon. It describes observations, not how things are.
- The problem with lucid dreaming and hypnosis is, like 'jumping', they are about subjective experience. Only personal experimentation can reveal the facts of the matter to you, one way or the other.
- When we are dealing with these things, philosophy and metaphysics are the appropriate areas.

We should be clear and not appeal to vague hand-waving science when it comes to these things - there presently *no* physical-chemical descriptions which account for subjective experience. There is no explanation for consciousness, or even an idea about what form such an explanation would take. (Refer to Donald Hoffman and neuroscientist Krisoff Koch for interesting takes here.) Repeat: there are *no good models which match the facts*. We don't even know why we perceive objects, how perception works at all, how eyesight works. So we must conduct our own investigations.

Where science ends, *personal investigation and judgement* must begin.

[...]

Science, Definite, Indefinite

> Definite science and higher science

Well, your distinction is arbitrary I'd say. A model which does not connect to observation is not a scientific model - it's just a conceptual framework. What you really mean is: proven theories vs unproven theories. It is worth reading the George Ellis article in *Nature* on this very point. The article begins thus:

> This year, debates in physics circles took a worrying turn. Faced with difficulties in applying fundamental theories to the observed Universe, some researchers called for a change in how theoretical physics is done. They began to argue — explicitly — that if a theory is sufficiently elegant and explanatory, it need not be tested experimentally, breaking with centuries of philosophical tradition of defining scientific knowledge as empirical. We disagree.
>
> -- *Scientific method: Defend the integrity of physics*, George Ellis & Joe Silk

It's the difference between something *corresponding to experiment* versus it simply being *self-consistent*.

> I think definite science can very well investigate human experience.

Science *is* the investigation of human experience, definitely. There is nothing else for us *except* human experience - and all human experience is subjective.

It has a limitation though: That it can only deal with those experiences which can be shared symbolically and which can be accessed in simple, describable ways. This puts much of subjective experience out of reach.

> It can definitely show and prove different and particular things that happen in our brain in various occasions.

Certainly. Observing brains even allows us to correlate certain 3rd-person imagery with certain 3rd-person reported experience. However, it does not allow us to *observe and measure the experience*. This cannot be done. That's not a problem really, it's just a recognition of what we are actually doing with science. It's all "inside us" and we can't get outside to measure it.

Intermission: An Exercise

Here's a worthwhile little exercise which emphasises the limitations we have:

- Point to your real hand.
- If you are pointing to any particular location - stop.
- Even by the standard explanation, the hand that you are pointing to isn't your "real" hand - it's a construction of the brain, inferred by sensory inputs.
- Try again...
- So it becomes obvious that wherever the "real" hand is (assuming there is one), it is "outside of all this". And what you are experiencing right now is effectively a "perceptual dream".
- Note: If you end up pointing to your head (where your "brain" is), then start again but this time ask: where is your "real" head?
- Bonus point: Now, *think about* your real hand. Where does that thought appear? Does it not appear in the same "perceptual space" as your sensory experiences? You just can't get "outside" of this!

Vision, Perception, Neuroscience

> We can exactly tell how people perceive objects and how perception works and your eyesight. We've discovered long ago how all that stuff works and how your brain processes information.

Unfortunately, we really haven't. Perception remains largely mysterious and unexplained. We can observe light going into the eyes, we can observe regions of the brain "lighting up" (terrible phrasing) but we do not have an explanation for perception. Cognitive scientist Donald Hoffman's interface theory talk is definitely worth your time. It specifically talks about visual perception from the beginning. **I strongly recommend watching that talk.** You can also read his related paper on *Conscious Realism*.Meanwhile, retired neuroscientist Raymond Tallis has a reasonable article that's worth reading for another perspective. Now, I don't entirely agree with him, but it nicely outlines the various considerations.

Proving, Disproving, Experiences

>So science can very well prove, that for any individual, something like dimensional jumping doesn't work.

This statement doesn't remotely follow from what you've just said, unfortunately.

> It's simply impossible and just superstition that makes you believe that something changed, but in fact, nothing ever changed.

If you experience a change, and that change persist, then something did change - right? Although in a sense you are correct: in some philosophies, a change is a shift of perspective with reference to an unchanging structure, rather than an actual change in the world.

> There's no chemical or biological or physical process, in which a dimensional jump could ever occur and in which reality could ever change.

Again, I must return you to a previous statement: Lack of an explanation does not mean lack of a phenomenon. If you experience something, it happens, regardless of whether you can account for it. It would probably help to return to a question I asked in an earlier post: Can you prove that you are conscious? Can your prove that you have thoughts? Can you explain consciousness? Can you explain thoughts? Does your lack of proof and explanation mean you have neither?

Note: A hand-waving "explanation" that these things "happen in the brain" or "emerge somehow" is *not* an explanation at all. If you can't say *how it works, precisely* then you have categorised it rather than explained it. The more closely you examine these things (for instance: vision) the more you realise we haven't explained them at all.

Outside, Inside, Nowhere

So I'm going to jump ahead here without having developed the full path for it, however all the essentials are there if you follow your experience, so...

We might summarise much of the above by saying that you are imagining an outside world, and you are *thinking-about* an world, that you have no evidence for other than the imagining of it.

Earlier I said that: Science = senses + imagination

By now you probably realise that the true situation is actually: Science = imagination + imagination

On Perception

> When we feel something, there's an electrical impulse sending information to our brain, which then it processes and it gives you the answer whether it's cold or hard, hard or soft, rough or smooth, etc.

That... isn't an explanation. Can't you see that? What do you even mean by "gives you an answer". Where and what is the "you" for starters! Keeping basic though, there are two ways in which this isn't an explanation:

- It doesn't remotely describe how light entering the eye is transformed into a full perceived environment.
- It doesn't remotely account for subjective experiencing.

You've basically said "the brain takes light and turns it into an image". That is not an explanation, you have described no processes whatsoever. You've said "magic", to link to an oft-used illustration.



Perhaps it's good to get back to basics. Light enters the eye, hits the retina, as an inverted image (although from the eye's perspective, it's not an image, it's a series of activated rods and cones of course). That information enters the brain. From a subjective point of view, my actual experience, I see a complete and unwavering room with *objects* which are spatially-extended in an environment. How *exactly* is this produced?

We do not have an account. It's fine not to know, but to say we do know when we don't seems unwise. A full description of perception will, in my opinion, incorporate complex memory. We do not see directly, we see (loosely) the thoughts that are triggered by information that enters our brain - which is of course then also an imagining... ;-)

Proving, Disproving, Experiences

> You can take a subject group and let them try the dimensional jump with whatever instruction it would be possible for them.

You are kind of missing the point here, because you are assuming we live in a "simply-shared world", which we do not. Dimensional jumping by its very nature cannot be studied scientifically (which means, "intersubjectively") because it "comes before" the basic formatting (check out our man Immanuel Kant). It is a matter of metaphysics really.

> Science = imagination + imagination No. Not at all. That's complete bullshit. Any scientist who ever lived/lives on this world would scream with laughter about that equation. It's absolute nonsense.

It's exactly how it is. Our perceptual experience is an imaginary one, "inspired by" accumulated information, triggered by snippets. We then make up connective stories in our imagination. Amusingly, the stories we adopt then *inform* our subsequent experiences. Your mind is a big happy fiction machine, feeding upon itself. Having been told this, you'll probably start to notice it in the coming weeks.

- Experiences leave traces which *in-form* subsequent experience.
- Thoughts are experiences too, which also act as *in-form-ation* for subsequent experience.

- Your life is a big, looping metaphor machine and you didn't know it until right now.

On Consciousness

Man, you didn't even *try* with the consciousness thing. I'm really disappointed! ;-)

> We simply have to answer this by saying that we have to accept that the universe exists and that we are real. So our thoughts and consciousness is too.

Okay, why not try this: The only thing you know *for certain* is that you are experiencing, therefore you are conscious and that you exist. Although you know that you are having experiences and thoughts, it is impossible for you to say what their *nature* is. You can *think-about* their nature, but that will just be another experience. In effect we end up saying: All we know is that we are experiencing. And what we are experiencing is a real... experience. We cannot say that it is a "real" anything-else though.

> There's no reality where dimensional jumps ever exist.

All that is required for dimensional jumps to exist, is for them to be experienced.

> My post doesn't underlie any faith ... It underlies science and reality. Facts.

But it seems to me that you don't even know that science, reality, and facts actually are. Except (now) you might say that they are *experiences*. Beyond that, though?

> I think if you read again what i've just written in my post, you should realize that dimensional jumps don't exist and that we can even prove that it is impossible and just a big hoax.

Unfortunately not. If anything, what you have done is further convince me that what I might have assumed was a solid world is in fact... a transient illusion, with no solidity at all, made up *only* of my experiencing of it.

In fact, I think you have convinced me that dimensional jumping - being a persistent experience - is perfectly possible and is not contrary to anything other than... *previous habits*.

[...]

It's unfortunate that usernames flag things up, isn't it? ;-)

Now I admit I've had a bit of fun with you, but you really aren't very aware of the gaps in your thinking. (This is separate from the whole dimensional jumping thing.)

> I'm not your average person like /u/TriumphantGeorge , who believes that science hasn't discovered yet how eyesight works.

Obviously I have to pipe in here: I understand exactly what science had done and described. It is you that don't understand how far we've got and where we've not. It's actually really embarrassing, but you are one of those people *who do not understand that they do not understand*.

> ...where your brain reviews and compares already existing objects (that where made by amino acids as actual matter in your brain) with the object you are currently looking at to eventually show you an image of what you're seeing.

This is... incredibly amusing. Can I see these objects inside your brain? Where is this "you" and how does your brain "show you an image"? Can I find this image in the brain? How *exactly* does this work?

Science isn't about such hand-waving stories. Perhaps you read too many popular science articles and take their enthusiasm as being actual models?

Now, I am *not* saying that there's some magical supernatural process. But I *am* saying that we don't understand perception and memory, in terms of structuring, and we definitely don't understand conscious experiencing. Basically, you don't understand the hard problem of consciousness, or maybe even that there is such a problem. A worthwhile read that covers the bases:

> We have seen that there are systematic reasons why the usual methods of cognitive science and neuroscience fail to account for conscious experience. These are simply the wrong sort of methods: nothing that they give to us can yield an explanation. To account for conscious experience, we need an extra ingredient in the explanation. This makes for a challenge to those who are serious about the hard problem of consciousness: What is your extra ingredient, and why should that account for conscious experience?
>
> -- *Facing up to the problem of consciousness*, David Chalmers
>
> [Q: ...who's talking about some nonsense like metaphysics (where I'm even annoyed that "physics" is within that word)]

That statement means you *really, fundamentally do not understand what you are talking about*. I actually think you perhaps have never read philosophy or physics beyond high school, and then never really thought about it afterwards. Is that right?

> > ...and refers to philosophy as the only true science and Science being imagination plus imagination

Yeah, I thought that was quite fun. I'd like to see you prove that it isn't that way, though. ;-) The point I was making was of course that perception and thinking are both structures of the mind, so that we are always in some way exploring our own minds.

> > It's just useless trying to explain such a clueless layman (to put it charitably) how things are.

The problem is that *you do not understand that you do not understand*. Perhaps it is the language barrier between us. But to give an analogy: Your explanations for conscious experience are like explaining how a computer works by saying: "the electricity goes in and the electronics make the pictures appear on the screen" - while not even having the *concept* of software. Now, "jumping" is a whole different thing...

Reply to “Is there any non-anecdotal evidence for jumping success?”

Well, it's important to realise that no consciousnesses are exchanged and there's aren't parallel universes in the sense of spatially-extended places. You aren't really swapping places with anyone. (*Aside:* MWI in physics is a pretty crappy *philosophical* interpretation of a *mathematical* theory and is not very well regarded, even though it gets a lot of coverage in "popular science".)

These descriptions are "active metaphors" - ways of conceiving of dramatic changes in your experience, and subsequently triggering them. They offer a way of changing your "world-pattern" by loosening your hold on it, and intending a shift. You might view this as triggering shifts similar to the spontaneous experiences reported in /r/Glitch_in_the_Matrix. As with those stories, often the only evidence is the memory of those involved. Why?

Inherently, there can't be any "objective" evidence - at best, only intersubjective agreement by a few participants. If the state of the whole world changes, there is no residual evidence of how it was before. The world-pattern remains inherently self-consistent. In fact, that may be the only rule.

If there's a bit of physics to support this, it's Wheeler's "Delayed Choice Experiment" - from which you would conclude that only *observations* are important, and the story we describe of what happens between observations is an imaginary "explanatory fiction". Wheeler himself was of the view that the "universe" was basically dimensionless information which accumulated and become more defined with each observation. In other words: each observation defines a "fact" which constrains what might be seen in subsequent observations.

Relevance to "Dimensional Jumping"? Well, "jumping" is a way to reset the accumulated observations to a certain level. Some of the key points:

- There is no world behind the scenes, beyond our experiences.
- All explanatory schemes are fictional.
- The pattern of your mind = the pattern of your world.
- "Dimensional Jumping" is a way to shift that world-pattern.
- The "one rule" means that after a shift all subsequent observations will be self-consistent. In other words, you will never encounter evidence of the previous world-state other than your own memories. (And you cannot guarantee those, necessarily.)

TL;DR: It's inherently an anecdotal phenomenon although it can be an apparent multi-person experience.

Reply to “Problem with the original story”

> [Korrin85: When I was about 16, I was friends with four other dudes. Since some of them have reddit accounts, we'll Ron, Harry, Neville, and Dean.
>
> Now while hanging out one day, Dean told the story his father always told him. According to his father, he "accidentally" traveled to another dimension when he was in trouble. Dean's father was being abused by his father and during a really bad scene, ran and hid in his room. He locked himself in the closet. In his closet was a door mirror. Dean's father, in a bout of fear only a six year old can feel when an abuser is coming closer to you, leaned against the mirror and in a desperate moment, begged and pleaded to be let in to the "other side" (the reflection).
>
> According to his father, right when he was about to be found, Dean's father fell through into the other side. Startled, he watched in amazement as his "reflection" was grabbed and taken away by Dean's father.
>
> After this event, Dean's father described his dad as the most respectable man he ever knew. He never laid a hand on him again. It was like a different person.
>
> Hearing this story from Dean made us want to try it ourselves. So, for a little over a year, we developed a technique to help "cross over" to other dimensions...]
>
> [Q: With the original story, a kid successfully uses the mirror to Dimension Jump from the dimension in which his abusive father was battering down the door, but how did the story ever get circulated by the author considering he entered a dimension in which there was no abuse?!]

The general answer is: because when changes happen *to you*, you can still remember how it was before, so you can tell the story. Otherwise of course nobody would ever know of changes happening, since the world and their memory would remain in step (which may actually be the case sometimes).

> > I don't know. It seems like there should only be 2 options: The kid doesn't remember his old dimension's father or he's contaminating the new dimension that doesn't have an abusive father with slander; In other words - we should be getting the story from the perspective of this dimension's story creator - not the kid who left the bad dimension!

That doesn't make sense.

So, the summary is that a kid had an abusive father and he jumped to a dimension where his father is not abusive. Naturally, the only record of this is in the memories of the kid and anyone who experience the change with him. The kid who did the jump *is the author of the change* and the story is from his perspective. Are you saying that the story should not be told? And are you suggesting that saying "my Dad was abusive in another dimension, but he's a nice guy in this one" is slander? Because I don't think Other Dimension Dad will be suing anyone for defamation... interdimensional law sounds tricky! :-)

I'm assuming he never told the story to his current nice Dad. But maybe I'm misunderstanding. What do you mean by "contamination" here?

> [Q: The story should be told from the perspective of the kid who had is body stolen about how the mirror took his body somehow. Any recollection of having a bad father wouldn't exist since this dimension's story teller only knows of a good father. Why would this dimension's story teller all of the sudden start saying his father used to be abusive when that never happened - hence why he left?! Any memory of the bad situation would be contamination in this dimension - the story would not be told from the perspective of the mirror version of the author.}

Okay, I see what you are trying to say: That from your perspective some kid just suddenly says his Dad used to be abusive but isn't anymore.

So for the moment let's put aside the "jumping" metaphor and approach this another way. Now, there is only one dimension/world:

- Imagine that I sat an exam last week, and got a low grade.
- I now decide to cast a "spell" so that I got a good grade. The world is "updated" so that I now did well in the exam. The world has been shifted so that in effect this has *always* been true; there is not trace of the old state of the world, except in my memory.
- If I tell people about this, it will be as if I suddenly say "hey I failed the exam but now I have passed". As far as they are concerned, I had *always* passed.

This is what was happening with the kid. But wait, what if someone else is wishing that I failed and the same time as I wished I passed? It doesn't matter, because:

- **Everyone has their own copy of the world.**

You can have any experience you want, including updating the world's facts and history. The "other people" you see are just images of other people, the versions of them that correspond to your current intentions (aspects of their Extended Person). Meanwhile, sensations and perceptions and thoughts of "yourself" are a version of "you" that corresponds to your current intentions. What you actually are, it turns out, is the "conscious space" in which your experiences appear - the experiences of yourself, other people, and the world. Our experiences do overlap with other spaces but in a non-simple way that can't be explained easily, because it is "before time and space" (and unfortunately we can only conceptualise in terms of moving parts arranged in mental space).

I've copy-pasted a comment from elsewhere which tries to explain this a bit more, kinda based on the Imagination Room metaphor:

On The "Sharing Model" Of The World

You are not a person, you are a conscious space having a "person-perspective experience" - senses, perceptions, thoughts, floating in awareness. The "person" you are might be considered as The First Tulpa.

Meanwhile, it is just not possible to conceive in thought of the way in which there is overlap between apparent perspectives. It is not a "simply-shared" world model. The other people in your experience are your aspects of those people - and the "you" you experience is similarly an aspect of that idea.

Often people talk about a "consensus reality" as if it's a bunch of people in a room, choosing the decor together. In fact, it's more like everyone has their own room, choosing versions of the other people and the

decor. In fact, it's even more like everyone is a room, and is choosing versions of themselves and other people and the decor. In fact again, not even a room because the room represents time and space, which are themselves "contextual formatting" within you... you get the idea...

And "idea" is the key word. People are "ideas" or patterns, and it is those ideas which appear in your experience. "You" are just an idea you have associated with yourself. However, even a little bit of self-examination reveals that you are more like the stuff that worlds are made of...

> In the future, people should set up their dimension jumping stories like this:

That's not quite right though. It's all about perspectives. From the *kid's perspective* (who is telling the story) the story is actually:

- "I always had a problem with my father being abusive to me. Then one day I looked in the mirror and had a really weird experience. It *felt like* I was somehow swapping places with the reflection in the mirror. After that experience my father was a nice guy. But what's even more strange - it was **as if the world had changed** so that he had *always* been a nice guy. Nobody remembered him ever having been a bad guy! It was as if I'd shifted to a new dimension where my father had always been a good parent."

Dimensional jumping stories can only be told from the perspective of the person who makes the jump, or perhaps with people who deliberately jumped as a group (see the Multidimensional Magick post for a comment on this: it amounts to "deciding" that you will have the experience of sharing the jump results.)

> Of course, the methods suggested in the sticky tell you to say "swap" to trade places with the mirror person so you're giving the person who once had a good father an abusive one. How interdimensionally selfish, right?!

Haha, yes. But the swapping places thing is a metaphor. There is no "other you" out there who is getting a bad deal. What you are doing is switching from one experience to another.

If you have a green car and decide to paint it red, that doesn't mean that some other person is forced to paint his nice red car green!

It occurs to me you might be thinking from the perspective of "a dimension" or a "god's-eye" perspective of all dimensions, but there is no such thing. There is *only* the perspectives of particular subjective consciousnesses. All experiences and all stories are 1st-person-view.

[...]

(Reminder.)

4 - No downvoting posters simply because they misunderstand something or have an idea you disagree with. If it contributes to the discussion and is in the spirit of the subreddit, it's all good.

Misunderstandings exists so that: a) we can correct them and, b) we can understand things better ourselves.

Reply to “Science investigations on the topic?”

I guess we have to ponder: What is there to investigate? How do you investigate a subjective experience? What do you mean by "real"? Things like "reality" and "the universe" are concepts, are heavily linked to the container concept of "an objective external world". What, *exactly*, is "a placebo effect"? And so on.

Science, kind of by definition, involves the cataloguing of "objective world" experiences and creating descriptions ("parallel constructions in thought") for them. It actually makes no sense to have a science of the subjective, since science is all about focusing on common experiences which are shared, and excluding those that are not shared or easily repeatable, and studying things which can be mirrored with conceptual frameworks. Studying the perception of people is *not* a study of subjective experience, for example. (Although perhaps the investigator's experience of apparently conducting such a study, could be thought of as an investigation of *their* subjective experience, by themselves.)

Having said that, there are attempts at physical theories which touch on these issues - particularly Quantum Bayesianism - but you'll note that they largely lead to a destruction of our default metaphor for the world. That is, they involve discarding the notion that the world is a "shared spatially-extended place unfolding in time", and that the "formatting" of our sensory experience corresponds to the formatting of *the-world-as-it-is*. Instead, the world becomes a sort of "infinite gloop of possibilities" from which various experiential moments are extracted as a sort of "private copy" of an apparent world.

Really, then, these issues are best treated as metaphysical concerns, and as such they have been touched upon in by philosophers and in literature for centuries. Berkeley and Kant, for example. Jorge Luis Borges, also, explored this in short "stories" such as the *The Library of Babel*, *The Garden of Forking Paths* and *The Circular Ruins*, all of which are relevant to our discussions here. In terms of assembling descriptions, we must follow their lead, but also bear in mind there is an important distinction to be made between direct experience and *thoughts about* direct experience.

So in the end this subreddit focuses on "the nature of experiencing" rather than the nature of "the world" or "reality" *as such*, because "the world" turns out to be an idea rather than a place. You can't scientifically study this, because science studies *objects* - while the target of *this* investigation is not actually an object; it is the thing "before" objects and ideas: an unbounded *subject*.

The subject doesn't exist, in the sense that *objects* exist - but it *is*. You *know* it because you *are* it; it is a direct knowing, by *being*. Since what you are is the subject, you cannot *find* the subject or "latch onto" it. Realising this is probably the foundational understanding. When you pause and look for where, exactly, "you" are, you find that you are everywhere, and have no edges!

The *fact of the content* is "reality", but the *content of the content*, the notion that there is something which the content represents, is illusory.

For example, if you imagine there being "levels", then the experience of the picture of the levels is true, but the idea that there are "real" levels behind that picture is false. This is what I mean by their being fundamental and relative truth. You are having an experience "as if" there were levels, but there never really are any levels - however, that does not mean the *experience itself* (of *apparent* levels) is not actual.

It doesn't *originate* from you as such though; that implies a separation between the experience and the cause. Right?

Maya is in what you *think about* experience; the experience itself is just what it is. There is no special experience that is more privileged than another that you should be seeking out. It is enough that you simply *attend to* your actual experience, now, rather than *thinking about* it. Then it is clear. All those words and concepts - maya and rādhā and whatever - they're completely empty in and of themselves, except that they point you to look at what is actually experienced. To some extent, they get in the way, because they encourage us to have all these discussions about them - somewhat in the manner of a "finger pointing to the moon" and then discussing the intricate workings of fingers instead of looking...

Feeling crap is just as privileged as feeling good, then. Although, for sure, one is usually more fun! And your power isn't something you can "understand", at least not in any way that is helpful, just as recording the physical measurements of a famous artist won't help you paint like him.

[...]

Why do you think the world should be expected to correspond to your desires? I wouldn't bother about "beliefs" - it's such an abused word that it's basically meaningless. What *is* a belief, exactly? The common usage seems to have devolved to "things that I think are true, when I think of things", but that's a surface idea. I say it's better to replace the vague idea with a more rigidly defined concept - hence the "patterning" idea.

Intention is what shifts the world. Everything else, all other notions as to how change is caused, are really *results* of intention - they have just become conflated with it because intention itself is not experienced *as such*, so people describe what they *do* experience instead. That is, the side-effects, the "me experiencing apparently doing something" which is a result that that arises as part of the larger result of "me experiencing getting something". If what you mean is, "why can't I experience being God" (in the "that from which everything comes" sense rather than an entity god), the answer is that you already are, always. Perhaps you have a preconceived notion of what being this would be like? If so, what you are actually seeking is a "peak experience", which has nothing to do with this at all; it's just another experience.

Are you expecting to experience "others"? You never will. You'll experience being less "personal" but you won't experience there being something other than *you-as-awareness* - because how could you?

Reply to “I would love to hear your feed back on this video - is he accurately describing DJing as you understand it or experience it? OR is your experiences with DJing different than he describes? If so, how are they different?”

Just to start: I don't think it's very helpful to define a "reality" as every change in experience (which is essentially what he does), because it makes it kind of a meaningless concept.

However, if we define a "dimension" as a particular "state", meaning a set of world-facts from which follows a deterministic set of moments, then we've got something more manageable. In this view, when we deliberately *intend* a change, or *imagine-that* something is true until it becomes fact, then we have shifted our state (really: our-selves). Our subsequent experiences then arise spontaneously from that state.

From there, it's not so much that you have to "start acting like the new dimension you jumped into is really there" - rather, you have to *not obstruct* or *react to* the sensory experiences that arise, including the experience of apparent physical movement. If you oppose the moments that then appear in your awareness, then you are in effect *re-intending against them* - and hence shifting state again.

In summary then, we're really talking about:

1. Adopting a new state and then:
2. Not accidentally intending against that state.

For this to make sense intellectually, though, we really have to reconsider what we think of as "me", which leads us to philosophical idealism or non-dualism. You are *not* a person in a world doing magick or attracting things across time and space, for instance.

Well, do remember that this is not an understanding of something that independently exists *as such*. So there's an element of "whatever works for you" to all this.

The only thing that truly matters, is that we recognise the distinction between the *nature* or *context* of experience (fundamental truth, you might say) and the *content* of experience (relative truth). Everything else is up for grabs, potentially. "Very subtle distinctions", then, are worth attending to, because how we conceive of the world shapes the structure of our experience.

The benefit in drawing the line of the definition of a "dimension" at this point - of a *world-state* rather than something akin to "what I am grossly experiencing right now" - is that it logically follows that you can have effortless experience with occasional redirects. It's more obvious that you do not need to maintain anything, and so on.

Also: no aliens! Unless someone particularly wants aliens, of course, in which case they can totally go for it. :-)

Yeah, it can be easy to get lost in formulations for their own sake, forgetting they're about constructing something *useful* rather than discovering something. (The exception being the discovery of our direct experience of ourselves.)

The subreddit overall is intended to be fairly concept-agnostic - hence the idea of "active metaphors" referred to in the sidebar and links. The underlying idea is that there is no particular "way things are". All changes are basically the intentional "patterning" of our experience/ourselves - to different levels of granularity. So, "dimensions" and "frequencies" and "grids" and "states" and "facts", they're all potentially useful as *self-formatting patterns*; none of them are inherently *true*.

Anyway, thanks for kicking off the discussion.

[...]

So, one form of that would be you reacting against an experience that arose as part of the state's path to your outcome - either because it seemed unpleasant, or because you can't see how it fit in, or you were trying to "make" things happen by directing them in a more micro way.

For example, perhaps as part of the sequence towards my outcome, circumstances force me into meeting up with someone who I find intimidating, and then they *are* intimidating, but my spontaneous response (rather than my *reaction*) is to stand my ground and say something out of character, and that resolves that situation and leads to my outcome in an unexpected way because that person has direct access to what I want.

Throughout all this I have to trust that the deterministic path, the path that has been created as part of my outcome-focused state-shift, is heading in the right direction, despite my fear and discomfort. I must do this even though I can't know it in advance exactly what will arise along that path, because I can't "pre-expereince" my experiences and it's never possible to think it out. In exchange for that *faith*, I benefit from the entire "world-pattern" having reshaped itself as a coherent whole around my intention, in a way that could never be planned using my basic thought model of the world.

However, to benefit from it I must surrender to it. Any resistance to what then unfolds in my senses is an intention against my current moment, but also the whole state. Since your state or "world-pattern" is a continuous whole - like a blanket of material with folds in it - to intend against one part - to tug on one fold - is to shift the entire world. (However, I'd suggest a strong outcome intention will not be completely mangled by a minor counter-intention that isn't directed at the specific outcome itself.)

In this context, the manual construction of a parallel structure in thought, which is then used as a plan for what needs to be done to reach one's goal. Perhaps "work it out" or "calculate what to do" might have been better ways to phrase it. The basic idea is, you can't "understand" the world enough to choose the correct action, but the information is there so that you can "know' what to do towards something you've intended - because it is the movement already occurring within you.

> we might even just call it perseverance

Although for some people that word can imply struggle and effort and pushing, perhaps? The best words are probably "trust" and "faith" and "confidence", if we can put aside any religious connotations they have in the context of action in the world (not necessarily a bad thing, since that's where the concepts probably came from originally, but just associations that are unneeded). Maybe a blend of both.

I suppose we might suppose two levels for convenience, something we often have to do when discussing these topics.

There is the "experience of struggling" as *content* - really just part of your sensory adventure - and then there is "resistance struggling" as *context* - which is when *you-as-experiencer* push back against the sensory adventure itself.

For example - using a retro film reference - if we were Indiana Jones in *Raiders of the Lost Ark* and we had decided we were going to find the Ark of the Covenant, then we might experience many struggles along the way, but those would be part of the "sensory adventure", and in fact our outcome would already be assured. However, we are simultaneously the actor Harrison Ford, and if we as Harrison Ford struggle against the unfolding of the adventure, of the script that is arising in our theatre, then we might derail that outcome, or at least (more likely) make the path longer and more punishing.

[...]

Haha, no, it's not a *Yes Man* type deal. It really simpler and more basic than that: to give up micro-controlling in the sense that you think something "should" unfold a certain way, and to not let your fear lead you to avoid things.

We might draw the comparison with body movement more generally: you don't actually need to control your body muscles "manually", and actually doing so tends to bring about inefficient and tension-producing results, because you can neither know what your body "should" be doing, nor consciously make it do such subtle co-ordination. Instead, you should intend the outcome (e.g. getting up from the chair; catching the ball) and let your body move by itself. However, until you've had that experience - there there *is* a movement that arises spontaneously in response to situations - then this probably doesn't make too much sense as a recommendation. Without a certain confidence or faith, there's the temptation to intervene and try to "make" the result happen - which has based on your crappy limited idea of the world. (In the specific case of body movement also, many people are constantly asserting their current position, and then overcoming it in order to move. So when they "stop interfering", they can feel sort of stuck for a while because they haven't "ceased asserting". We might wonder to what extent we continue to assert aspects of our world-state.)

So, what we're talking about here is the larger version of that - not just the experience of body movement, but of world movement. As far as disruption goes - I'd say that the outcome is never fully de-incorporated, but by asserting something that is counter to that outcome, you have at least reduced its relative intensity, its relative contribution to your future experience. If you feel you've lost your way at some point, then re-intend?

> when we are learning a new movement (dancing, sports, etc.) we have to control our muscles "manually"

Obviously we've talking about intending other sorts of outcome here, but when we learn a new body movement, I would still say that we *don't* have to move our muscles manually really, as such - and that attempting to do so gets in the way, actually. We still direct ourselves towards outcomes.

We shouldn't be trying to co-ordinate our muscles directly ever, I suggest - largely because we *can't*. We have no access to them in that sense. If we try to control muscles directly, what we in fact do is *generate an experience* of "controlling muscles", rather than *generate an experience* of "body moving as I'd like". Approaches such as Ideokinesis and the Franklin Technique for dance, or the Michael Chekhov approach to acting, or the Alexander Technique for general movement, follow this route - using intentional imagery or

merely outcome-intention in order to bring about movement. Neurones don't have much to do with it (in the sense of what "we do" or what "they do").

If you haven't checked out chapter four of the *Michael Chekhov Handbook: For The Actor* yet, it's worth a look if you want to do some body movement experiments using intention.

> >Since we can't know in advance exactly what will arise along that path, it seems to me that we have no GPS for manifesting.

Why do we need one? This assumes we need to progress step by step, as if we are walking across rocky and uncertain alien terrain. The is the opposite of how we want to go about things! Once the landscape is set - the deterministic path of moments is chosen - we don't need a "GPS". *Again: the path is already set.* We just need to not derail what we've done. If we are in doubt, we might periodically assert the outcome, but we shouldn't be "checking ourselves" (even just because of what that implies).

You are not *navigating* a landscape, you *are* the landscape - even though you only perceive a slice of it in your senses at any one moment - and your intentions work by changing the contours. If you stop fiddling all the time by intending stuff constantly due to doubt and reaction, if you stop "thrashing your world", then you don't need to keep correcting yourself. The moments of the landscape "move through you" as *the-perceving-space*; you don't go anywhere.

To use another metaphor, we might conceive of an intention as inserting a particular scene later in our script - and by the magick of movies, the script from *now* to *then* immediately rewrites itself to lead us there. So long we we don't do another rewrite, we just need to let the movie play out. We don't "do" our character, we experience it.

> > ...claims that sometimes he gets error messages from the "ethereal software" he uses to heal or manifest

As for ethereal software and error messages, all that's doing is adding another layer of "how things work" on top of something that is, in fact, super simple. Sure, you can have experiences "as if" that's how the world is structured - but you're still just intending something extra you don't need (namely, that there is such a thing as "ethereal software" and that it gives you messages). Why not just go straight for the outcome and let it play out?

EDIT: I get that you might want to "check" the outcome, but I'd suggest that since there is no way to do this independently (the intention behind the action implies an outcome in itself), it's probably still better to continue to intend the outcome if you have doubts.

So, I'd maybe summarise this as:

- When you intend something, you are directly updating your "landscape" of upcoming moments with a new fact, incorporated into your existing patterning.
- All intentions are basically of the form "let my experience now unfold *as if* 'this' were true".
- The 'this' might be an event ("let experience unfold *as if* 'I get the job' is true") or a general fact ("let experience unfold *as if* 'there is such a thing as ethereal software'") and so on.

- It's up to you how much "mechanism" you explicitly or implicitly introduce into this; but there is no *real* mechanism behind the scenes. There is no "how it works"; intention operates "before" that sort of structuring.
- "Checking" is also potentially an intention to have a certain experience. Are we then going to check the checking? And so on!

To emphasise: We have experiences "as if" certain facts were true, but no fact is fundamentally true. There is no way to get outside of this and be an independent navigator or checker.

[...]

Body Movement Experiments

> But it's ineffable.

We are, here, at the boundary of what can be discussed! Once you have the experience, it makes more sense.

So, visualising (visually or kinaesthetically) is also a *result* of an intention, really. The intention itself isn't "anything", because it *is* the change in state. Or to be clearer: the "intention" is the potential pattern that you are increasing the intensity of; "intending" is the name we give to that act of intensifying. Anyway, putting that aside, you got some minor twitches. Something to check, then is that you are not also simultaneously asserting your current position as you do this. In other words, are you holding onto your current position so that you can move from it, instead of fully committing to the target position? It is very easy and common, I think, to end if "wishing" the target state and "wishing" your current state at the same time - to "ask" to both move and stay still simultaneously! The actual experience is more of a *releasing into* the target state.

One idea which might help, is to conceive of yourself as containing all possible positions simultaneously - it's just that your current position is "brighter" than the rest. You are therefore permanently in a state of elastic potential, primed for movement in any direction, and it's not a case of deliberately moving in one of those directions, so much as *ceasing to obstruct yourself* in that particular direction.

Meanwhile, another way to stop yourself getting stuck in a "visualisation as cause" trench, is to do something more basic. Every day, just lie on the floor. Then, *having decided that your body will get up*, do nothing at all. Importantly, don't engage in *staying-lying-down* either. Just let whatever happens, happens. Eventually, your body will stand up, effortlessly and perhaps in a manner or sequence you could not have predicted, "by itself".

At this point your recognise that intention is perhaps best thought of as "inserting facts into the background", which later arise in your sensory theatre. It just so happens that we have become used to thinking of only intentions associated with immediate results as being "us doing stuff" - in addition to confusing the *result* of muscle tension with the *act* of intending.

Checking For Results; Feedback

> [Checking for result] I don't understand what you mean by "independently".

If you have done something which you have decided or intended *means-that* a future event will occur - there is no way to check whether that event will happen without interfering with it. The act of checking implies something, because it has meaning. For you, the act of checking *now* might *mean-that* it is doubtful that the event will continue to be true *then*.

> With Chekhov's exercises, for instance, you actually have a feedback.

Yes, because you are intending something whose sensory result is within the current moment, more or less.

Beyond that - when intending a future event - you would be seeking sensory feedback for something that has no sensory component in the current moment! (Although the exception to this is that there can be a subtle background *felt-sense* of your overall state.)

This is where doing that lying down exercise might assist, because you will have the experience of having intended a future event ("standing up"), doing nothing about it or to interfere with it, and then it happening "by itself" in a later moment.

You probably need to conceive of your situation differently here. One helpful analogy: your ongoing experience can be thought of as a deterministic landscape or sequence of "sensory moments" across which your "sensory attention" scans. When you intend something, you shift that landscape. If the part of the landscape you are changing happens to be the part you are looking at, you will "feel yourself doing it" because the result will be visible in the very next moment. However, if it is a part of the landscape you aren't looking at, you won't have any sensory feedback until you get to that moment - minutes, weeks, months later. It is true *now* that the result happens *then*, it's just that you aren't experiencing then, now. (Whew!)

Asserting For Outcomes

> Well, you should know the answer [whether it is best to just assert the outcome], or you wouldn't have created the Two Glasses method... :-P

Haha, well, I'm me, y'know? :-)

Yeah, "how to assert/intend properly" is the key, but as we're noting here, it's not actually something that can be described in words. It's like "shape-shifting" - it's not something you *do* because it is the movement of your entire self, rather it is an act of "becoming" a new state.

That's why instead we use a cheat. In Chekhov's case, the cheat is that we *imagine-that* there is such a thing as the imaginary body, and then this *implies-that* doing something with it will lead to a result. What this actually does, is shift our focus away from intending the movement, to intending the feeling-image which then *implies* the movement. We've dodged the question of how to intend the movement, and distracted ourselves from the issue of how we intend the feeling-image! The generalised version of the cheat is: find something you are already intending, then attach your desired outcome to that. This is how the Two Glasses exercise works. Everyone knows how to intend writing labels and pouring water, so we take that and piggyback another intention onto that.

> Not-so-triumphant moments?

Everyone is omnipotent, but that doesn't necessarily mean jumping off a building results in a flying experience, for example. The movie always matches your script - by definition! - but you are not starting with a blank page here. You are in a state and that state is effectively the present draft of this movie script.

This current state is the sum of all previous intentions *and their logical implications* (see handy visualisation).



Altering the relative contribution of those patterns or facts is what "intending" is all about. This means that having outcomes which are "unlikely-seeming but plausible" is relatively straightforward, since it amounts to simply overlaying a pattern on the existing landscape. Having outcomes which break your model more, however, requires an amount of "ceasing and releasing" (stopping implying your current state, as with the movement examples above) and intending alternative deeper patterning or formatting.

For example, the purpose of the three main metaphors in the sidebar is to provide just such an alternative formatting. If we are looking to come up with a feedback mechanism to inform our approach to change, then the sense of resistance on encounters when asserting that those metaphors are "true", is a good start. Extending this, we can also sense there resistance when we assert other facts as true, be they general or specific.

I say: just leave the sensory experience of resistance alone, allow it to be there rather than try to push against it, and instead hold the intention.

> > so as i see it now, pushing against it is like reasserting it correct? fighting it/not allowing it thereby asserting the underlying truth of its existence? I just dont know, sometimes i feel like the resistance that arises comes out of fear, and i wish i wasnt afraid, but i am, sometimes i think i have been so consumed by fear all my life that is like a fish swimming in water, not knowing its environment, but ultimately needing it to survive.

That's how I see it.

So, there is your intention and there is *whatever the intention implies*. If we resist something, we are implying its existence and also whatever we think that thing *means*. The only way around it is to "be okay with whatever is happening". Which doesn't mean we can't change things via intention, but intention shifts things

"underneath" (or that's one way of saying it); we can't grip onto sensations directly and they are non-causal anyway.

(An intention always involves a complete shift of everything to an extent, since there are no "parts" to a state, and being a whole means things must be coherent and self-consistent, at least as a landscape if not as story.)

Fear: Totally normal. I have been an extraordinarily afraid person, almost afraid of simply existing, in times past. But fear is a *sensory experience*, and it's actually the squirmy resistance to the sensation that's the bad thing. If we can accept the experience as it is - "be okay with the moment" - then it becomes just an experience (albeit one that might contain useful information about our state or situation).

That's where the whole "be the open space" thing comes in very useful, and that idea of "being an ocean rather than a glass of water" - because the ripples of fear are nothing to an ocean. That kinda thing. This loops back around to the "ceasing" again; that's how we are able to allow ourselves to open out.

[...]

> [Q: Interesting. I've noticed that if I quickly alternate between the actual movement and the imagined one (to see if I can profit from the residual "after-image" of the target), my arm seems more willing to follow its phantom twin, albeit partially. It starts raising, as if pulled by a force field, falling back after a few inches. This "magnetic" sensation has made me remember another freaky "arm moves by itself" exercise. Perhaps, physical explanations aside, the pushing-against-the-wall might be seen as a rough way to set the target intention...]

I think you make a good observation about the pushing-against-the-wall exercise being a rough way of targeting intention - the action *implies-that* it will happen, plus perhaps that it triggers the ceasing of downward resistance which might have been opposing upward intention.

Which segues nicely into your last point: where do unwanted experiences come from?

"Unforeseen side-effects" is probably not a bad way to put it, but we should be careful we don't think of those side-effects as being in any way deliberate or specified or even created *as such*. The world can perhaps best be thought of as a "dumb patterning system", with each intention being the equivalent of intensifying a particular pattern into prominence such that it is "relatively true". [1] However, the world is also a coherent whole - it always "makes sense" because it is one cloth - and therefore if we make one fact "true" then that logically implies other facts are true, within our specifications. There are different versions of this though, and not all fit into "stories":

For example, if you intend "I will have good posture", then that implies your body will shift shape, tension will release and your body will elongate. Logically, all your trousers might now be too short and you'll have to buy a new wardrobe. Meanwhile, if you intend "I will meet Jim next week", then logically that implies you and Jim will be in the same location at some point, which also implies that, at the point of meeting, there will be an *apparent* plausible history that "explains' that meeting. You are defining more than just the meeting, in other words. Now, these two examples make sense in terms of there being a "story", but the way they come about is not a story-based structure; it is more like an abstract patterning system. I quite like to use the example of moire patterns for this:

- Say there's something I want, let's call it *A*. This might be an event I want to happen or a fact I want to change. In any case, something I want to bring into my experience, a particular "pattern" I want to see in the world.
- Meanwhile, we've got the world as it currently is, which we'll call *B*.
- Now I intend the new pattern, *A*. By doing so I activate that pattern, in effect overlaying it on the world, *B*.
- From this I get the overall result, *C*, as my new world.

Now, there is no sense in which I really *chose* that final pattern, and there's actually no way I could predict it (because I cannot see the entire all-space all-time pattern of the world at once), so in effect *every* overall result is an "unintended side-effect" of my intention. However, the *intention itself* is always guaranteed to be overlaid and appear in experience, so that's where we focus our attention.

What's important, then, is that I specify my intentional pattern in such a way as it corresponds properly to what I actually want. If I just intend "owls" then the generalised pattern of owls will be overlaid upon the world without regard to space or time; it's like putting on spectacles with owl-patterns on. If instead I intend "owls on Tuesday in the city centre", then I have localised the intention to a particular part of the world-pattern.

Beyond this, it's a matter of course correction as the larger world-pattern arises in the senses, moment by moment, as *being* becomes *being-known*.

[1] Here, we can refer back to our earlier notion of all bodily positions existing simultaneously but at different "brightnesses". Similarly, all possible fact-patterns exist eternally. When we intend, we are not *creating* something (if we can think of it, it must already exist!), rather we are making it a more dominant component of the world-pattern, thereby increasing its *contribution* to ongoing sensory experience.

> > So, we need to combine the intending/increasing-of-new-A with some kind of releasing/decreasing-of-current-B, as in the Two Glasses...

Well, I would say that Two Glasses is a level up from this in terms of structuring, since it is a content transformation - you have a defined situation you want to change - but the point about releasing is right, and the underlying notion is the same of course. If you are going to rearrange a rug, it's going to work better if you're not stepping on one corner of it at the time!

One difficulty in terms of thinking about it is that you can't "do" releasing - it's more of a "ceasing to interfere" or a "stopping gripping". Many people aren't even aware that they are gripping onto their sensory experience with narrowed attention. But anyway, it's really intending while surrendering to any shift, "being okay with whatever happens".

In general, if you intend something into prominence then the logical implications of that pattern will take care of the contrary pattern. If you intend yourself into *holidaying-in-Barcelona* then *working-hard-in-Arizona* will tend to diminish itself logically anyway.

In other words, there is no *combining* to be done really, since it's part of a continuous whole. There's a little bit of "do or do not" to all of this.

[...]

> [Q: **rather, you have to not obstruct or react to the sensory experiences that arise, including the experience of apparent physical movement.** So when you are displeased with a physical interactions that may put into a sense of fear within you or anger, etc negative feelings; Should we not react to those circumstances we have come into contact with, so that we may continue focusing on the goal/intended experience we are aiming for?]

That sounds about right. I'm making a distinction here between *reacting* and *responding*. A reaction is a resistance against the sensory experience. A response is a flowing action which arises from the experience.

If (metaphor incoming) you were watching a film running through a projector and you didn't like the image on one of the frames, you wouldn't try to push against that frame - that would derail the flow of the film, maybe even switch you to a different movie. Having faith that the future images in the reel were your desired outcomes, you would allow the film to flow unimpeded.

Reply to “What happens to the other 'you's when you jump?”

Although it's fun (or disturbing!) to contemplate, there are not any "other yous" in the sense of physically (in a separate space), simultaneously (in a parallel time) "happening" (unfolding in time). I'd suggest that the only thing that is "happening" is your 1st-person ongoing experience right now.

"Dimensions", as an (active?) metaphor, provide a way of conceiving of a discontinuous change in the content of that ongoing experience that breaks your usual narrative of the world as a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time". Other narratives might then seem more appropriate - for example, we might think of "the world" as a sort of toy box containing all possible patterns and facts and moments, from which we select our particular "private copy" experience of a world.

> > I rather like the "private copy" metaphor, it helps me grasp the whole idea of "patterning." The only thing I don't understand is how it can be "private" when our toolboxes seem so show the same pattern, and my patterns can influence your patterns. I'm sure you get this same question in its different forms very often, and I guess it can be boiled down to this: if objectivity doesn't exist, then why do our subjective experiences "sync up" so well?

There are a few ways to tackle this, but let's say: if *objectivity* doesn't exist, then *subjectivity* doesn't exist - there is just "experiencing". Therefore, our subjective experiences in fact *don't* "synch up" at all. Your current experience is the whole thing, you are *being-a-world-from-the-perspective-of-a-person* (and by "a world" we mean a particular shaping of the metaphorical eternal "infinite gloop"). The *Hall of Records* metaphor gives us one way to conceive of this. It essentially says: all perspectives exist, but the only thing that is ever "happening" is this experience, because "experiencing" == "happening". There is no "outside" to that. However, really, we have a problem here: that our thoughts *about* experience are themselves experiences, and so already formatted into pseudo-sensory object-based experience. We cannot therefore think about experience; it is already "too late". What we are talking about is "before" division and multiplicity. So, we might say that there is only one toolbox, not many, and only one experience, not many. Strictly speaking, given the above, we should say that there are *not-many* toolboxes, and *not-many* experiences. We literally can't conceive of this in the abstract, we only conceive of particular experiences, *as* experiences! Although we can't think *about* it, we can directly attend to our experience and get an unmediated insight though. (Excuse some recycling here.) A silly little exercise illustrates this. We might close our eyes and try to:

a) find the "edges" of your current experience.
b) find where "you" are in your current experience. *and:*
c) investigate what your current is experience is "made from". *finally:*
d) think about yourself, and then note the location of that thought and what it is "made from".

The conclusions of this are the facts upon which all of experience is built. (Try it before reading the next paragraph!)

I anticipate what you discover is: there is no edge to your experience, and so there is just a sort of unbounded space of "awareness" rather than "*an*" or "*the*" awareness; you seem to be both everywhere and nowhere, you are unlocated and unbounded; the entire experience appears to be "made from" you, as in ***you-as-awareness*** rather than *you-as-person*; what you previously considered yourself to be is a *thought of* you, and that thought is located within *you-as-awareness* and is made from *you-as-awareness*.

Eventually - from this, the experiences you might generate from other exercises, and some contemplation - you conclude that the only inherent property of experience is *being-aware*, and that to talk of there being "other" subjective experiences or an objective world is not right or wrong, but *meaningless*. You can't "understand" this in terms of conceptualising it, but you can *know* it, directly.

> I've spent my whole life using "subjectivity" basically as a synonym for "experience."

Me too, largely, which is why it's worth doing what we're doing now: just emphasising that it's a shorthand for "the subject" rather than it being a perspective that is embedded within an environment.

> I'm imagining an Alex Grey painting with an infinite pattern of eyes embedded into the background, which alludes to the idea of awareness being an inherent property of all things.

A nice image. If the background is made completely from "eyes', then all objects which appear within it are also made from "eyes". Although, because that can suggest that one part of the background is "looking out" at another part, it's probably better so that it is made from "sensing" or "being". That way, we get the idea that the background doesn't go beyond itself, it simply experiences itself, in and as the shape that it has currently adopted. This is where we eventually come to the idea of calling it "awareness" and its only inherent property being *being-aware*. However, it's really useful to come up with different visual images, like the one you suggest, for helping us grasp particular implications of this. So long as we bear in mind that the true situation is "non-dimensional", as it were, then we can't really go wrong.

> At the core of reality I imagine a uniform, unbounded 3D grid ...

In some respects this is similar to *The Infinite Grid* metaphor, I suppose. These metaphors can be very useful for: a) conceiving of a structure which can be used to formulate intentions; b) providing a thinking framework to discuss certain experiences. It is important, though, to note that it is not "how things really are" - because there *is no* particular "now things really are" or "how things really work". There is no stable underlying substrate within which we are operating, hence the "formatting" of your world experience at an abstract level is just as much a pattern as everything else. When we intend something, we not only intend that outcome, *but we also implicitly intend the conceptual framework that was used to conceive of it*. That is, that when you intend to go out into the garden, you are also implying the extended pattern of that intention, which involves apparent houses, gardens, a persistent environment, spatial extent, unfolding change, and so on. So, every intention is a shift of the entire world! However, we tend to only intend things that are consistent with our current experience, and thus every time we go out into the garden, we further entrench this entire universe or dimension (that is: patterned state). What we are doing on this subreddit, what the exercises encourage, is intending an outcome which is *not* consistent with our current experience of "how things work", and thereby we reveal to ourselves that "how things work" is something we implicitly intend and which is within experience, rather than some stable independent landscape that we navigate across.

> This node could be described by some as an "ego," a container for the awareness. Is this description compatible so far?

Well, the ego isn't a container for awareness. Awareness has no edges or boundaries, it is what everything else is "from", so it cannot be contained.

What you think of as the ego is just a concept. In terms of what you *actually experience*, I'll be it's just an occasional thought that arises here and there, which you *attribute to* an ego. Again, what you are actually experiencing is being "awareness" with sensations, perceptions and thoughts arising within and as it.

The little four part *investigation* demonstrates to you this fact of experience. It is important, though, to actually *do this*, to attend to experience directly, rather than just *think about* it. Your thoughts about it won't get "behind" it, they will be just more experiences, deformations of your current experience - like rippling a pool of water that you are trying to perceive the surface of. Realising this, you discover the the "ego" is really a *thought about* an "ego", rather than an actual thing. It is a pattern of experience, nothing more. (I suggest.)

Reply to “Jumped. Are my friends/family still my friends/family?”

It's just not like that. There are no "alternate" versions of your friends and family elsewhere. The ones you have in your experience are the only ones there are. Now, for sure, they might change over time - and you might even trigger such changes if you deliberately intend to - but then, people change anyway, you included.

Pause and ponder: where *exactly* would these alternates be? Would they be observable? How could you tell if this had happened or not - *other than just thinking about it*? There is no way. You're worrying about an idea you've got focused on, I think. It falls into the same category as worrying that the people around you are automatic zombies. (Hint: don't start worrying about that, please!)

Maybe stick to this concept: "dimensional jumping" is about triggering change in your experience, and drawing conclusions from that. If something hasn't obviously changed... then it has remained the same. Don't worry that it's somehow "alternate" really, underneath. There is no underneath.

> This is why I need to jump to get rid of my OCD.

OCD: hmm, something which is *all about* intention, really. So, you can do that, definitely. You can also consider that, finally, the way you get out of OCD eventually, is by *firmly deciding* that you don't need to respond to everything that appears to you - for example: don't take your own thoughts seriously, they're just imagery! - and also have a firm idea of how you want things to be.

This seems easier said than done, of course, if you're in a state of "narrow focus" - since everything that comes up appears to completely dominate your experience, and you get whisked away by them. So you might think of doing a few other things:

- Do a daily releasing exercise: literally lie on the floor each day for 10 minutes and totally give up control of your body, thoughts and attentional focus. Let them move and unwind as they want, without interference. Over time this will "open you out" and make you feel more grounded.
- Throughout the day, whatever you do, try and include - *not* focus upon - the area of your lower abdomen. And when it occurs to you, *move from* that location. For example, when walking down the street, rather than moving your muscles or thinking ahead to your destination, move that centre and let your body follow it. Over time, this gives you a stable persistent aspect to your experience.
- Whenever it occurs to you, or whenever you notice you are over-focused on something, pause and *"cease!"*, and then mentally "feel out" into the space around your body. Above, below, behind, in front, around. And feel how that space goes on forever. Sort expand your sense of "presence" to fill the room, and beyond.

All of these things, taken together over time, will help have the effect of making you feel that **you are a stable, powerful "space" in which your experiences appear**, rather than a little ball of vulnerable attention that can be batted about by whatever winds of thought and circumstance arise.

[...]

I'd definitely agree with that: the ideal approach is to become aware of yourself as the *context* of experience.

However, in cases like this where someone is dealing with anxiety or problems with attentional focus, it's a lot easier to first stabilise the *content* of their experience using something which is always available: a bodily location, but one with no unfolded content in its volume of space.

Once you've got that sorted, *then* you can start looking for the background context - which probably involves a bit of "creation by implication", since it's more of a "selecting out" than is the abdomen thing (which is more obviously readily available for most people).

An additional advantage is that, for the majority, the abdomen is where their "global summary" feeling is. People with tight attentional focus are often suffering from situational blindness, due to being focused in their head area or even outside their body altogether. Gaining access to that *felt-sense* can open up a whole new lived awareness for those people. This, in turn, makes expanding/dissolving out further both more appealing and more attainable I think.

[...]

I've always been interested in trying to find "meta" structures behind ideas and descriptions and then seeing if they can be used for creative purposes. I was quite into the abstract metaphors used by people like Edward de Bono in his early work (see: *The Mechanism of Mind*), Edward Tufte's work on visualising information (see: *The Visual Display of Quantitative Information*) and the thinking styles of people like David Bohm (see: *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*). So, a sort of "clean, abstract, diagrammatic" approach to constructing conceptual frameworks, where you are better able to avoid triggering accidental associations, and hopefully develop generalised descriptions with broad applicability.

> Does having this sort of skill benefit you in your day job, if you have one? Just curious.

Probably been both a help *and* a hinderance. Sometimes there are things that have been around a while, and they've become benchmarks for historical and accidental reasons rather than logical ones, but "infrastructure" has developed around it, which relies on it being that way. Basically, something is *nonsensical* at its core but a self-supporting structure or business has been built on top. In those situations, having a "hand-waving" notion of things that skips over the cracks can make it easier to navigate than having, for amusement or profit, attempted a more "essential" telling of the story.

(Fabricating an example for illustration:)

By a "hand-waving" notion I mean things like: "oh, that program takes in all the inputs and then matches them up, projects them into the future, and that's our prediction" - and then just using the output number as the basis for all decision-making, and seem to kinda work.

When you actually look into what's happening, though, you realise that "the inputs" are all of different types, they are not "matchable", and the projection algorithm was written for a different sort of business entirely. The reason it *seems* to work, is just because the rest of the infrastructure is *self-consistent* in its misguided use of that number.

So, knowing that the number is rubbish, and that making decisions based on it is literally nonsensical, is somewhat of a hindrance, when your job is to make decisions based on that number, and justify them in terms of that number.

(This sort of thing applies to society as a whole, too. Note that I'm *not* saying that society should be run on logic, though! And luckily the rest of the ideas here - intentional outcome as independent of narrative, and so on - can compensate for this, and "hand-waving" situations can even be said to provide extra freedom of possibility.)

Reply to “I'm ready to jump, I just have one thing I don't understand...”

If you follow the implications fully, then there *are* no "other people" and there's not even a "you-as-person". Rather you are *that-which-experiences* and you have "taken on the shape of" the experience of apparently *being-a-person-in-a-world*. You are never talking to anyone in a fundamental sense; you are just having an experience "as if" you are a person who is talking to someone.

As for coming back to your "previous reality" - you never really go anywhere anyway, you simply modify your ongoing experience (of and as *you-as-experiencer* or *you-as-awareness* which "takes on the shape of" situations, states and experiences) to align with an idea you have. So if you want to return to the previous experience, the thought of that "previous reality" basically *is* that "previous reality".

> So you mean my jump will sort of feel like a manifestation?

Well, I dunno - what does "manifestation" feel like? (I know what you're getting at.)

If we just keep it simple: all that changes is that some of the "as-if" facts about our experience become different, from that point onwards. Everything else is just a story *about* that, a description we make up about something supposedly "behind" the experience. (Those descriptions are, of course, also just experience: the experience of "thinking about experiences".)

So that might be the fact of some object showing up later (which wasn't expected to and wasn't going to happen otherwise, it seems), or it might be the fact of whether you are ill or not, and so on.

For sure, it's always tempting to want to create some narrative about things happening "out there" somewhere, which lead to a change. But it's more accurate to simply view the world as a fully-defined pattern, one which includes the pre-determined set of sequential "sensory moments" which will appear. *That's* what you are changing: the sum of all facts and patterns, which exists *now*, and which you might call your current "state". Metaphorically, we can think of that state as being "dissolved" into the background of you, with only a particular "moment" of that state "unfolded" as a sensory aspect, in sequence. (Where "you" is *you-as-awareness* rather than *you-as-person*; that latter being just a "formatting" of experience, itself only a pattern.)

[...]

Well, you *are* awareness - so if *you* aren't choosing and redirecting, then *it* isn't either.

Which means it's more like a "material". Metaphorically: a "landscape" which takes on the shape of patterns, experiences, and whose only inherent property is *being-aware* - rather than an "intelligence" that does things. Hence why I sometimes use the phrase "dumb patterning system" (although the word "system" can be misleading too).

So, if you don't deliberately redirect experience, by *shape-shifting* yourself to another state, then it's more like your second description. If you *do* deliberately redirect, then it's *still* like the second one, except that now you are taking on the experience of apparently *being-a-chef-painter-composer* and are using that identification as a platform from which to shape the rest. If you do this knowingly, though - that is, you actively choose, but you recognise that the "choosing" is itself a result, an experience, rather than a cause - then that's probably the best

position to be in, since it accepts that there is no "higher" experience. All experiences are at the same level, and the fundamental nature of experience is *being-aware* (the fact of all experience, regardless of content), and *self-shifting* ("intending", "direct imagination", whatever) is the only cause.

> I find it hard to identify myself with awareness. I see myself as a tiny subset of it, and I see awareness as something infinite.

It *is* infinite, but not in the sense of being an infinite expanse, not like a *place*.

It is infinite in the sense of having no particular fundamental form; eternally containing all possible patterns and being able to "take on the shape" of them, making some patterns more "intense", relatively speaking, than others.

>Surely, I'm aware, but I'm not aware of "everything".

Why not?

Are you perhaps conflating *being-aware* with being aware of something as an expanded, 3D, multi-sensory experience? It can be helpful to think of "everything" as always being there, but at a low "intensity" - sort of "dissolved" into the background of yourself. Like in the blanket metaphor below: all patterns are always present, but their relative contribution is different, and only one aspect of the full pattern is "unfolded" into sensory format at any one moment (in fact, that is what a "moment" is).

The sense in which you are "awareness" is not the same as the phrase "to be aware of". The latter usually refers to a particular sort of experience. It would be better to say you are awareness *as* everything, perhaps. A fundamental problem we have here, though, is that this is something that inherently cannot be thought about (see the metaphor of the beach, later).

>I can see that some aspects of my experience match my intentions, while others pop up without a direct assertion.

It's not necessarily the case that you deliberately intended anything. "Deliberately intending" is sort of an intended experience itself.

There's a bit of a language issue here, but the way I'd suggest "intention" is interpreted is that: "an intention" is a particular pattern whose contribution to ongoing experience is made more prominent or intense; "intending" is the increasing of the prominence of a pattern.

And so, "intending" isn't equivalent to "making a decision and then asserting that something will now be true". That is an *example*, of intention, perhaps.

Furthermore, it's important to note that since you are not just a "void" state, you are already patterned. And so, any intention that you do make is done as a modification to that pre-existing structured landscape. Your intention will therefore also involve an increase of the *extended pattern* of that basic intention, plus an increase in any implied patterns. Every intention is a shift of the entirety of the state, to some extent.

For example, if I intend that "it is true *now* that my arm will lift shortly" then I am also intending the full meaning of that assertion, plus effectively re-intending its full implications (of a body, of the formatting of experience as a space, of time, and all the other stuff). If I do it in response to a fearful situation, then perhaps I am also increasing the pattern of fearful situations - and so on.

> So, if I'm all-encompassing awareness, where do those non-deliberated things come from? And why am I unaware of the intentions that brought them about?

Ultimately, I'd say this is about conflating "intention" (the shifting of state, changing the relative "intensities" of all possible patterns such that their contribution to ongoing experience is altered) and "doing things" as a person. They are not the same. The latter is an experience.

Also, I feel that the phrase "all-encompassing" is still built on the idea that the world is some sort of "place" that exists in the same form as it is experienced, and that someone you are an object or container which has enveloped them. Now, that's okay as a metaphor sometimes, but it can be unhelpful. It's more accurate to say that what you are is the *subject* to all experiences; you are what the experience of anything is "made from". And so you don't really experience *actually* being a person-object in a world-place. Rather, you have experiences "as if" that were so - just as a ripple on a piece of blue canvas is not an experience of "a stormy sea", it is an experience of "a ripple on a piece of canvas" that is shaped "as if" there was a stormy sea.

It might be useful to revisit some previous metaphors. We have:

- ***The Blanket****:* What you truly are is the "non-material material" whose only inherent property is *awareness* or *being-aware*, and which "takes on the shape of" experiences. Right now, *you-as-awareness* have "taken on the shape of" the experience of apparently *being-a-person-in-a-world*. This can be conceived of as a *non*-dimensional blanket, within which there are folds (fact-patterns) which represent the world (world-pattern or current state).
- ***The Beach****:* The metaphor of the beach - about metaphors. It is not possible to build a sandcastle which captures within its form both "the beach" and "sand". However, the sandcastle *is* both the beach and sand. You can certainly label one part of the sandcastle "the beach" and another "sand", but the properties of those parts, being of form, will not capture the properties of the beach and sand themselves, which are "before" form. If you forget this, and start building ("thinking") further sandcastles based on those labelled parts, all further constructions and their conclusions are immediately "wrong", fundamentally, even though they may be coherent structures ("make sense") on their own terms.
- ***Patterned States****:* All possible patterns exist eternally with and as awareness, and all patterns always contribute to ongoing experience. However, they differ in their relative intensity, their relative level of contribution. Note that patterns are not located; they are unbounded and everywhere-nowhere, "dissolved" into awareness. The current experiential state, then, is equivalent to a particular distribution of pattern intensities, which you might think of as a set of "facts" which fully define a world or scenario (although those "facts" might be quite abstract, sort of meta-facts). One of those fact-patterns is that of "time passing". That is, a particular state fully defines a sequence of moments which unfold deterministically unless the state is shifted again. In order to shift one's state, one must change the relative intensity of patterns, which is done by *intending*. In this metaphor, "an intention" is a fact-pattern which is to have its relative contribution to experience increased, and "intending" is the intensification of that pattern. There is no method to intending, no mechanism or act involved, and no cause and effect. It is akin to *shape-shifting*. One simply "intends". Intending is *the only cause*; all apparent causes are in fact results of intending, in the form of patterns within a state.

Also, check out the *Feeling Out Exercise* as an example of an attempt to change perspective, the point of which is to emphasise, by direct experience, that you are *not a person* - and thinking of yourself being a person who is some sort of controller is misleading.

Rather, again, you are *that-which-takes-on-the-shape-of-experience*, and it just so happens you've ended up having become formatted as a *being-person-in-a-world* experience. And there is no "outside" to that. (I think I've used up my hyphen quota for the day, there.)

TL;DR: You can't have *an experience of* being "awareness"; *all* experiences you have actually *are* "you-as-awareness". A bit like how everything you see is made from "seeing", but you will never actually see "seeing" no matter what visions you have. An issue we have here with language is that it is structured to talk about objects, about *content*, and we are trying to talk about subjects, *context*. Hence having to introduce extra meta-level concepts, like "awareness" and, in our illustration there, "seeing".

> > Ultimately, the experience of being a non-local consciousness, however amazing, is just another arbitrary experience.

I'd certainly agree. There is no "special" experience that is elevated over any other experience. However, there is an elevated recognition, or insight, embedded within that exact point: that is, that all experiences are of the same nature, and that "experiencing" is what you are, rather than any particular experience. The subject or *context* to all *content*.

> > So, what exactly makes the patterning model (or subjective idealism in general) better or more helpful than materialism (where, similarly, we're at the mercy of dumb mechanical laws)?

Not "better", just *differently useful*. However, the point at which assumptions are made is "earlier" here. Materialism -> subjective idealism -> patterning-type, in order of shifting-back of the baseline assumption. And in this case, we are fully recognising the assumptions, and admitting only one single fact as ultimate (see later).

We can probably be clearer here, beyond that. The "patterning model" isn't intended to be an *explanation* of experience. In fact, the very idea of an explanation of experience is meaningless - what with an explanation just being yet another experience: the experience of "thinking about 'experiences'".

Rather, it's more of a "thinking structure" which contains only the most basic, and hence the least limiting, concepts which correspond to a structured - *patterned*, if you will - ongoing experience, such that we have, and such that we might desire. So it's a way to describe experience in a way that's as close to the straightforward notion of experience as a sort of rippled *you-as-awareness* (with nothing "behind" it, no assumption of any further objects independent of the subject, which in any case makes no sense once you examine your direct experience) and also as a way of formulating intentional change.

The nature of experience isn't something that is *thought out*; it is something that is directly recognised (although there may be some wrestling with thought, and some experimentation and investigation, prior to that; something the subreddit explores). That recognition is the starting point really, although you can proceed "as if" it were true and get experiences which correspond to it. The recognition being: the only fundamentally true fact is the property of *being-aware*. All other facts are relatively true only, which is to say that they have varying degrees of contribution to ongoing experience.

For the sake of conceptualising this, we say that all facts or patterns are eternally present, just at different intensities. However, of course, that is itself starting from a "later" point, but - as with the "patterning" model - it is a reasonable starting point, because really we are using only discussing "apparent observer/experiencer" type situations, rather than *void-awareness* type states.

Essentially, the "patterning" model (which isn't special, it's just a nice platform from which to discuss the more abstract basic properties of a structured experience, and the lack of limitation, while still being able to use language) says something like: what you are is "that which takes on the shape of patterns, but has no inherent or fixed patterned state, and this constitutes the structure of your ongoing experience" and "all experiences are on an 'as if' basis only".

Again: there is no *theory of* experience to be had, in the sense of an explanation of "what is really happening behind the scenes". There is only the *structuring of* experience - and a *self*-structuring at that.

> Does this mean that jumping and manifesting techniques work only when the target is coherent with the pre-existing landscape and its implications?

Not necessarily. Although: yes, if you are simply going to intend an outcome without addressing its conflict with the current state (in which case you'll perhaps get lots of symbolic synchronicity and dreams, but no event or factual change).

Something like the *Two Glasses* exercise obviously just leverages pre-existing patterning (to do with levels and intensities, transfer and transformation, association and assignment and so on) and doesn't deal in discontinuities and suchlike. It doesn't make any attempt to adjust the more abstract patterning upon which sensory content is structures; it only intensifies (so to speak) a particular "outcome-fact" in preference to others, with the rest of the "world-pattern" landscape being metaphorically dragged into alignment with that, like pulling a fold on a blanket of material (as before).

Meanwhile, the *Owls of Eternity* exercise operates more directly, but deforming yourself with the extended pattern of "owl" without specifying spatial or temporal restraints - hence it's a bit like scribbling an image onto a television screen, only the extended patterning means that you get the full *meaning*, the symbolic associations, coming into play rather than just literal owls.

Now, the lessons from those two exercises can be applied further:

In the first exercise, we are taking pre-existing localised patterns of the "landscape" and adjusting their relative intensities - selecting them form the landscape, and modifying their prominence. In the second exercise, we are intensifying a general component pattern across the whole landscape, everywhere and everywhen, in quite abstract fashion. Combining the two, we might consider how we could modify the general structure of the landscape we are starting with, the more abstract *formatting* rather than just particular outcomes or world-facts...

In short, this approach - which isn't really an approach, so much as a recognition of "self-shifting" independent of any particular "method" or apparent "mechanism" - needn't be applied just to events. You could apply to to the structure of experience itself. In that way, your intention - specified *in terms of* a particular interpretation of "landscape", such that the intention is basically "outcome + formatting" - needn't be limited by that pre-existing landscape, perhaps.

Hence, in the sidebar, the reference to "active metaphors" and the notion of configuring experience to be in terms of, say, a sequence of moments floating in perception, a memory block, or whatever (leveraging Jorge Luis Borges's metaphors, for example). Or, indeed, a "patterning" of an "imagination space", or *you-as-awareness*.

Reply to “Correlation Between Beliefs/Perception and Experience?”

One issue is that people tend to mean different things by "beliefs" - so it's worth considering what *exactly* they are, in the sense of their form of existence, and how it is expected that they have a causal role. I suggest that if what is meant is roughly "stuff that I think is true when I think about something", then they are not particularly causal. If what is meant is something more like "the relative facts contained within my state", then maybe. The problem here is that when you dig into the nature of experience, the perspective on these things tends to shift such that the original meaning of "belief" might not really be coherent anymore.

However: I'd say that where "belief" comes in is that if you believe something (in the sense of feeling that "it is the case" when you ponder it), then you are less likely to relentlessly tinker with things and second-guess yourself. It's in *that* way that it corresponds to "detachment". Which is really to say, not constantly re-intending or counter-intending something you've already asserted.

The final instruction in the *Two Glasses* is, "just carry on with your life". Which is a (deliberately indirect) way of saying, it is already done so leave it be. The change occurred at the moment of the exercise, and so "it is true *now* that this happened *then*", with all subsequent moments being defined by that intention.

All subsequent moments are a result of the intention, aspects of a state which now incorporates your outcome.

If you "believe" that or at least don't bother about it, then those moments will arise spontaneously (including moments of you apparently doing things, etc) and eventually you'll encounter the moment which contains your outcome. If on the other hand you have doubts and fiddle - doing additional intentions to try and "make" it happen, or spend time deeply concentrating on the possibilities of it not happening - then you are effectively doing a new intention, or at least a counter-patterning, thus shifting your state again. Note that we aren't talking about passing thoughts here and occasional loss of confidence, but about getting focused, deliberately or not, upon counter-patterns. The important bit is, though:

Those subsequent moments might contain feelings of doubt or even unpleasant events.

If you resist those feelings and events or try to manipulate them away, then you are intentionally shifting state again, possibly to one that no longer contains your outcome. (Although I'd say that it's probably quite forgiving if you have a successful intention, unless you resist things like spontaneous physical acts that you are "meant" to perform.)

Another consideration is that when performing intentional acts, we tend to imply the extended pattern associated with that act, which gives the idea of the act meaning. So if you *react* (which is intentional/resistant, rather than *respond*, which is spontaneous) to something in terms of an expectation associated with your old situation, you are in effect strengthening that pattern again, to some extent anyway. Ultimately, then, the answer is perhaps: **forget about beliefs**, because the concept isn't that meaningful in the end, and also the course of action would be to do nothing about them and just treat ongoing experience as a "dumb patterning system" which you interact with in a *direct* fashion (that is, you are *shifting yourself* in order to adopt a new state; there are no intermediary mechanisms or entities involved).

> ...had waned in the past few hours and I thought I'd f'd up.

Yeah, I understand the concern! But, no. I think it's fairly ridiculous to expect some sort of permanent joyous experience [as a sign of success or as an ultimate ambition]; that's not the promise that is made.

In truth, *no* promise is made, really. What you *do* get is, to notice the fact that - loosely speaking - what you truly are is "awareness" which is "patterned" into an experiential state, from which all moments follow. And so, subject to one's own experimentation, what you have is the *possibility* that you can re-pattern yourself.

From this, if you were to insert a particular fact into your state - a future event, say, such that it is "true *now* that this happens *then*" - then the *only* guaranteed thing is that fact. The rest of your state will have accommodated that fact such that the moments from *now* to *then* are continuous, but besides that there is no guarantee regards the content of your experience. Your assumptions about what "should" happen between *now* and *then* are irrelevant; they're just little ideas you are thinking, nothing more.

You might even feel massively depressed for weeks until, one day, some event happens which completely transforms your viewpoint, and then your intention seems to come to pass, as if the event caused it. However, actually *the entire sequence of moments* was the result of the intention, not just the moment of that event. The intention was the cause of the whole thing, not the event.

This doesn't mean you have to simply accept feeling crappy, of course! You can intend adjustments or whatever. The point is, though, that the idea that you have to constantly control every moment in order to maintain yourself and get an outcome, is flawed. That view assumes your are like a boat sailing on choppy waters heading for an island, and you have to keep re-asserting your course. Really, though, you are the boat *and* the waters *and* the island, and your (accumulated) intention defines all three. Now, for sure, if you find you have intended against your outcome, then it's fine to re-assert it. But it shouldn't be viewed as an ongoing battle against the psychological weather; the passing waves and winds are *actually part of* the course you have implicitly defined for yourself.

> I've read through your reply a few times to try and fully get it

The final paragraph is meant to suggest that whatever feelings that arise within you don't indicate that an intention has "worked" or "not worked". When you intend something, it's like you've inserted a fact into the world directly - and the "world-pattern" shifts at that moment to incorporate it. That insertion is the only thing that ever really "happens"; everything else, all feelings or whatever, are you experiencing the resulting state.

As I said, though, you don't need to simply accept feeling crappy. As a *separate item*, you could address that. You'll probably note the connection between the perspective adopted for those exercises, and the expanded viewpoint implied by, say, the *Feeling Out Exercise* in the link at the end of this comment. The focus being: *experiencing* and the "directness" of it. At the back of this, really, is a reappraisal of what you consider to be "you" and what you consider to be "the world".

[...]

A couple of quick comments for now [actually they weren't quick after all]:

> But these "feelings" you get after intending something are a lot different from wandering thoughts and ideas about the intention.

The wandering thoughts, emotions and so on are pretty much what I'm referring to here, because that seemed to be what OP was talking about rather than a direct apprehension. The "deep intuitive feeling" - what I've tended to call things like the *felt-sense* rather than "feeling" to try and make them distinct - is something else. That is different to "feeling bad about things", including having passing bad emotional thoughts and feelings (thought which are just feelings, for example) *about* the situation. There's a difficult-to-articulate difference between a sense "about" the situation and a sense "of" the situation, too.

> [When you intend something, it's like you've inserted a fact into the world directly...] I cannot agree that it's as simple as inserting a fact into the future and having it happen.

Perhaps I should rephrase this as: When you *successfully* intend something then that is *identical with* inserting a fact into the world directly.

It *is* as simple as that, but only if that is what you do. If you do something else instead, then you don't get that outcome. If you don't intend the actual pattern but something else, or if you subsequently counter-intend, then you've not actually intended the update. If you want to draw a shape on a piece of paper, you have to actually draw the shape you want - and not another shape, or a drawing *about* the shape, or a drawing of drawing a shape - and then not subsequently draw on top of it. Intention is "direct" in that sense; there is no interpretation for you, and no gap (although there are additional concerns such as what is being brought in by association or whatever). If you don't get an outcome, then it's because you were doing something else instead. Working out what that something else is or was, is part of the experiment and fun.

> You have to be willing to give up your life, your personality, your goals, everything you have in order to detach.

A brief way to say this is perhaps: you want to simply "cease" to intend in reaction to moments which appear, and only intend for occasional updates. So your default is to "be okay with whatever happens" (including things like your body positioning and movements; it's not just the big things) which is identical to simply leaving one's state alone between shifts.

But there's some granularity to this. While our state is a single unbroken pattern, and so we might say that all intentional change is a change of everything to an extent, including reactive intention - it's not the case that one has to let go completely of everything, and always, to get any outcome incorporated into oneself. (But one has to not be stepping on the rug that one is trying to move, at the moment of movement.)

The *Two Glasses* exercise is really intended as something of a demonstration of that, and a starting point for exploration (which is why it and the *Owls* exercise are referred to as "demo exercises" of course). As one experiments more, then subtleties are noticed, but I think you really have to actually conduct the exploration, essentially of the condition of your own patterned state, to get further. Because lots of descriptions - involving "detachment" - don't make much sense until you do. Things that seem like they will an "action" involving "objects" upon reading, turn out not to be that in experience.

I think that often ideas like "detachment" tend to suggest to people something that they have to *do*. And so they try to find the best way, method, technique, and understanding that will lead them to this. But, and the same applies to the idea of "intention" itself, that can become part of the problem. How can you detach when you aren't really attached to anything (because you aren't separate from anything)? How can you intend when

there is no separation between you, the intention, and the thing being manipulated (and not even a "you" as such)?

So I agree with you in much of what you say, but I'm inclined to think those issues are sort of collateral ones, that it doesn't necessarily pay to try to address directly, because to some extent they turn out to be mirages later. Perhaps similar to saying (reasonably) that to move one's arm efficiently what you want to do is both relax and move at the same time - but when you get to grips with that through experience, it turns out to be more like a direct unbroken shifting of the whole rather than two acts on an part of the body. The description only makes sense from that perspective, afterwards, because only then does it gain meaning - and it can actually get in the way beforehand. And so, perhaps, with advocating "detachment" as an aim to work towards, rather than something which comes from, is a way of trying to describe, a more direct understanding *after the fact.*

[...]

We're mostly on the same page here (half the discussions on this topic are basically working out that people agree, just in different words, it sometimes seems!), except for the last section. Again, though, this might be somewhat a matter of terminology and perspective.

> I suppose when I say detachment, I'm talking about a state of nothingness, a void. Technically we shouldn't need to detach from anything because there is no separation.

That's an indication that "detachment" invokes a mental image which is unhelpful, I think. It suggest something spatial, to do with contact, and that is misleading (another reason I'm not sure it's a helpful term except as a shorthand in retrospect).

> It is like a blank slate. This is the state that monks are aiming for. This is the state that people often call "enlightenment".

"Enlightenment" is such a misused and mistranslated word, I'd say. For me:

I would *not* say the void state, or the adoption of the void state, is equivalent to "enlightenment". It is another experience just like any other. There is generally a sense of "having-being an experience" even though it is not spatially or temporally structured; it is not entirely blank. That is possible too, but not completely, because otherwise you'd not come back from it. So, we should probably distinguish between a "void experience" and a "void state". The ultimate void "state" *would* be one where the particular distribution of relative "intensities of contribution" of all patterns would be completely flat, near-zero contributions. There would be no re-remembering a world experience afterwards. Here, then, we are talking about a "void experience".

The sense in which that is associated with "enlightenment", is that having such an experience can tip you off that the only thing is fundamentally true is *being-aware* or "awareness" - because you have experienced everything other than the pattern of *being-observing*, all object content, disappear. But the actual experience is not special in some sort of hierarchy. It is only special in that it might nudge some insight. But you can have that insight right now, simply by attending to your present experience and realising that you are "everywhere but nowhere" within it (and that what you think of as "you" is just the perspective-structuring of the moment) and it is all "made from you", thereby recognising that all boundaries are "imaginings of boundaries".

That *recognition* is enlightenment, I would say. Which is why it is such a problem to articulate: it is not content-based and it can't be described, since it is "before" division and multiplicity and objects, and conceptualisation and language depend upon dividing things into parts and then re-relating them in a metaphorical mental space.

Looping back:

> If someone wants to get real, meaningful, consistent change with their jumps, they have to detach until they reach this state of nothingness.

Your other point does still stand, though I wouldn't describe it that way.

That is, that if you "cease" reacting and maintaining completely, the experience of doing (not doing!) that *can* be like becoming a void - then you are no longer preventing a shift simply by having held content. When in this position there is (almost) no opposition to intention since there is no conflict between the patterns corresponding to the content of the moment and the pattern you want to bring into prominence (because you have a void moment).

But you don't *need* to do that. That's like deleting your whole street temporarily in order to reposition your sofa. You only need to avoid holding onto a pattern which conflict with the intentional pattern. Just like when you move you arm, you don't need to go all floppy or lie down first - you simply intend arm movement without also intending or implying anything counter to arm movement.

Aside - It is genuinely instructive, for those who haven't done so, to experiment with effortless intentional movement. After all, there is essentially no difference between modifying "the fact of my arm's position" and any other fact; but feedback is instant and within one's perspective.

> That's why the results on this sub are usually 'tame' or rather inconsistent. Someone may do two glasses. And it works with amazing results. But when they try to replicate it or do something bigger, it fails.

That's really because it is not intended for that; it's a demonstration of a very particular thing.

The two exercises (*Owls* and *Glasses*) demonstrate two specific aspects of experience - although ultimately they are the same thing of course. *Owls* is demonstration of direct re-shaping via intention; *Glasses* is a demonstration of indirect re-shaping via implication.

One of the benefits of the *Glasses* is that it reminds us that *this experience right now* is a pre-patterned image; it uses patterns of meaning already present to structure an intention, and it works even if you don't understand it conceptually. That's a valuable lesson in itself. But, inherently, it is not going to bring about discontinuities, because it is itself part of a continuous experience. Often I say that results will be in the form of events which are "plausible if seemingly very unlikely to have occurred".

The *Owls* exercise is completely free from, and if you experiment with that, using different intentional patterns, there's much to learn about the "directness" of intention and experience. We move from abstract "owl" type patterns to more specific patterns involving spatial and temporal aspects, and then we realise that the visual (say) is an aspect of the pattern, and that you are operating with patterns directly. That helps us towards comprehending that "you are the whole scene" of your ongoing experience.

Anyway, I wrote out a bit more than was required there, just for the general benefit.

> Full scale detachment is the only real way to make any use of DJ consistently and regularly.

Since "DJ" is not just about results - because there is an inherent problem with the overall concept of "results" I think - then I'd say that a *full investigation of one's ongoing experience and patterning* is the way to make full use of it. That is the way the exercises are set up: they are called "exercises" because they are no "methods" or "techniques"; the reason for this is that ultimately there is no "mechanism" or "how things work", and no "act" which can be formed upon the world. Unpicking *that* fully is the only real option eventually; everything else turns out to be just another pattern or experience which brings with it a new set of implications and hurdles, on an endless "seeker's journey".

Of course, aiming for results is the perfect motivation for this! I'm not criticising that at all, just the notion that any particular piece of experiential content or conceptualisation or any apparent act is the "solution" if only we can find it. *That's* the idea that we should really want to take as step back from, and consider from a "meta" perspective. I still quite like the term "imagine-that" from one of the sidebar posts - short for "imagine the fact of something being true" - as a handy term to encapsulate the nature of sensory experience and how it is shaped. If you were to, right now, "imagine-that" something in your current world experience was different, how would you go about it? Or more to the point: *is* there a "how to go about it"?

> **Imagining That**
>
> When we talk of imagination and imagining something, we tend to think about a maintained ongoing visual or sensory experience. We are *imagining* a red car, we are *imagining* a tree in the forest.
>
> However, imagination is not so direct as that, and to conceive of it incorrectly is to present a barrier to success - and to the understanding that **imagining and imagination is *all that there is*.**
>
> We don't actually imagine in the sense of maintaining a visual, rather we "imagine *that*". We imagine *that* there is a red car and we are looking at it; we imagine that *there* is a tree in the forest and we can see it. In other words, *we imagine or 'assert' that something is true* - and the corresponding sensory experience follows. We in effect *recall* the details into existence.
>
> It is in this sense that we imagine being a person in a world. You are currently imagining *that* you are a human, on a chair, in a room, on a planet, reading some text. We imagine *facts* and the corresponding experience follows, even if the fact itself is not directly perceived. Having imagined *that there is* a moon, the tides still *seem to* affect the shore even if it is a cloudy sky. And having imagined a fact thoroughly, having imagined that it is an *eternal* fact, your ongoing sensory experience will remain consistent with it forever. Until you decide that it isn't eternal after all.
>
> *Exercise:* When attempting to visualise something, instead of trying to make the colours and textures vivid, try instead to fully accept the fact of its existence, and let the sensory experience follow spontaneously.

[...]

There is no waking up in the sense of getting "outside" of experience, of course.

However, there is a waking up to the *fact* of the dream, and the nature of the experience in terms of "you" and "the world" - and this changes the *meaning* of the content of your experience.

Of course, we might say that this is a change in content too - but generally when people are talking about getting "results" they are talking about still having exactly the same structure of experience (apparently a *person-object* in a *world-place*) just with improved *person-world* circumstances. We can go further than this, though. And to not do so, when there is a possibility of digging further, is to remain wilfully ignorant, surely? It's good to be at least aware there is a choice, anyway. This change in meaning is the "meta" aspect, and is itself a change in circumstances, but not of the world.

It might be useful to distinguish, then, between the "formatting" of experience and the "sensory content" of experience. If someone is just seeking an improvement in circumstances, then they are just looking to change the "sensory content". But without pushing and investigating beyond the basic - potentially incorrect - assumptions (about the nature of experience and the nature of descriptions; our usual picture of the world; etc) and addressing the "formatting", any improvements are going to be pretty limited, I'd suggest.

The underlying concept of this subreddit, ultimately, is based around an investigation *via* the quest for results, without necessarily making assumptions about how things are or what will be discovered. This makes it a little bit different from a "how to make my life better!" subreddit. If we judge our experiments by binary success or failure of outcomes, as if we were talking about a "method" or "technique" connected to a specific "mechanism" or "how things work", we're probably missing the true value of the whole endeavour.

We might also consider, too, what the value of getting "results" is, if they are in the end just a distraction, to pass the time as it were, until we die, in much the same overall state as we were when we began.

[...]

It's really meant in the sense of "do not resist the sensory moment that is arising". Because to do so is a counter-intention which, in any case, usually isn't properly directed at a considered outcome. It doesn't mean you have to *like* what comes up, nor that you can't choose to intend a change in your situation. So it's not "be okay" in the sense of "be happy with", it's more "be okay" in the sense of being okay with *the fact of* the experience as an experience, not *react* to it blindly. Other ways to describe the same idea may be more useful - for example, talking in terms of an open focus, etc. It depends on the context of the conversation really.

[...]

Try the *Feeling Out Exercise* in one of those links, as a starting point! As you say, if you have to "remember" (conceptually reconstruct) other peoples words or ideas, then that's not really what you are after. Actually, you simply want to directly notice how things are.

Something to keep in mind, though, is that the *the truth is always true*. There is no "higher" experience; all experiences are of the same nature. For example, the experience of "apparently being a person sat at a computer" and the experience of "apparently being an infinite void" are both equal, both made from "experiencing" or "awarness". It's recognising *that* - the sort of "meta" realisation about the *content* versus the *context* of experiences - that is what you are after. And so seeking a particular special experience, including the experience of thinking an insightful thought, is an error.

Your final sentence is spot on:

> I guess the uncertainty doesn't really lay with wondering if the world is real, but rather with how much influence I have over what I experience, which I suppose can only come with seeing how things play out for the next little while.

The search for "what is true" is the search for "what never changes". This requires experimentation and attending to experience. I would suggest that the eventual conclusion is perhaps that the only thing that is *fundamentally* true is the fact of the property of *being-aware* (and so you conclude that what you *are* is "awareness"), with everything else (all content and patterning) being *relatively* true only. In other words, all experiences are on an "as if" basis only ("as if" something was true), and the only thing that is always true is that fact that there is an experience at all.

Reply to “wanting to a jump to a fictional universe - are there any limits?”

> > You're limited by the laws of physics. In order for something to happen it first needs to be possible.

How, exactly, are you limited by the laws of physics, though? How do we decide whether something is possible? Surely the metaphysics of things like "jumping" are somewhat "before" all that, since they even challenge the notion of there being a "you" as an object in a world that is a "place"? It all emphasises how our descriptions are actually non-causal "parallel constructions in thought", and have no limiting factor in themselves. To expand: The laws of physics are not "laws" in the sense of being an externally imposed set of rules. Rather, they are a codification of the observations of regularities in our experience-to-date (formulated in terms of an "objective world" container concept). They are *descriptions* rather than *inherent structures*. Beware the "reification of abstractions", and all that.

In other words, while experiential content limits the possible models which can are useful, our models do not limit the possible experiences. Models are not "causal". Since the "laws of physics" are derived from your experiences to date in "this dimension", they have nothing to say about future unusual experiences - another "dimension" - other than you've not yet had them, and that *so far* they might seem unlikely (although "unlikeliness" is a pretty meaningless term).

> > If you want to go adventuring into your favorite fantasy realm then you should be looking into lucid dreaming instead.

I'd agree that lucid dreaming is a good way to experience different realms. However, it would be a good idea to contemplate what lucid dreaming *actually is*, and why we are inclined to think that our *current* experience is not a "fantasy realm"? Could this be a lucid dream from which we just never woke up (actually, then, really a non-lucid dream, since we have no awareness of a larger context)?

> > Using dimensional jumping as a tool to fulfill selfish desires is foolhardy. Every action has an equal and opposite reaction. Beyond the charitable nature of the living present, everything has a price.

That all sounds a bit "monkey paw", surely? *All* desires are "selfish" in a sense, because they arise from a particular worldview even if they are supposedly about helping other people. That's not a problem, though. We must each come to our own morality. There is no external judge who rewards us for good intentions and punishes us for bad.

It is true that there are always "collateral effects" if you make a change - just as there is for making any change. With "jumping", this becomes more obvious because the pace is accelerated. However, these are not *reactions* as such - they arise because the world is a single continuous pattern and so it must always be coherent, "make sense". Everyone outcome you get (that is not discontinuous) will have a (borderline at least) plausible narrative associated with it, just as part of the overall pattern, and that narrative may not always be to one's liking. As I said, though, this is true of *any* change, so it's not something to get overly worried about.

[...]

Ah, but - What makes you think that the experience you are having right now is other than a "mental figure"?

And in what sense are the "laws" of physics (noting again that that word means a particular thing in science, something more like "observed regularity that has been modelled") externally imposed? Strictly speaking, the laws exist *because we thought them up*. Whether the *observations* exist because we think them up, in a sense, is a matter worthy of contemplation.

Reply to “Dimensions and reality”

> But, if Reality matches our beliefs and expectations, how do we explain surprising and unexpected events?

Why would you expect there to be no surprises?

Similarly: if we know the laws of physics governing the behaviour of matter, why do we encounter surprising and unexpected events? Because we didn't make the calculation or conduct the experiment prior to the event. You only experience something when you experience it. This is different to just loosely *thinking about it*.

Say you have a pattern - which we'll call a "fact" - and that pattern corresponds to the state of the world. Now you add a new pattern. The combination will be the final state of the world - but can you know that state in advance, prior to experiencing it? No. To even calculate it is to experience it, and that is assuming you have access to the complete original pattern and its addition. Once that pattern has been made, it may be possible to look ahead and see what future part of it you are going to encounter - but again, that will be to have an experience. Beliefs may be described as being one of those patterns.

The problem here is in that word "match". It's better to say that beliefs and expectations *contribute* to our ongoing experience, and that the degree of contribution can be adjusted. OP was too bold in saying "our beliefs *are* our reality" without clearly defining their terms.

> Is the underlying mechanism affected by faith or skepticism?

It shouldn't be, *provided you commit to the exercise at the time*. Faith is what leads you to: a) fully commit to doing something rather than just half-heartedly going through the motions, and: b) not tinker about and interfere with things once they are done, to "carry on with your life" with confidence.

If you don't really do something, then it's less likely to work; if you keep picking at what you've done, then it's less likely to work. (The skepticism supported here, that of trying something out with an open mind and judging it by the results, is of course different from having a hands-folded "prove it to me" challenge approach.)

> [in magick is it the case that] we decide the desired final state and the universe churns out the necessary intermediate steps

Well, that's exactly it. If you think of the "world-pattern" as a complete landscape consisting of all experiential moments across all time, then what we're doing here is *defining the content of certain moment* - in effect we are creating a "fake observation". Although we might be looking at *this* part of the landscape and gradually walking along it right now, for a brief time we look at *that* part of the landscape and observe-define it. And because the world-pattern *is* a single pattern, and therefore must be self-consistent, the rest of the landscape is shifted accordingly such that everything is coherent - meaning that the terrain from *here* to *there* are now defined as a set of intermediate steps "for free".

(It's like a blanket of material with folds in it. Adjust one of the folds, and you inevitably tug on the material a little as a whole, which results in other folds changing shape. There is no process required to create the other movements or to ensure coherence; it's just inherent to the setup.)

So the most generalised picture, then, is one where there are a set of factual patterns which all contribute to experience at all times, but with some patterns having a time context, as if they were "masked off" temporally speaking. That's why there's a difference between just triggering patterns (by imagining owls), and intending in a more specific way (by imaging owls in a localised spatial and temporal context). Both are pattern activation, but the details of the pattern are more specific.

[...]

"Prediction" should probably be reserved for: *reasoning* out a future experience based on the current sensory experience. With a pre-existing landscape of events, you are either "observing" (*literally acquiring* information from the landscape of facts), or "defining" or "asserting" (*directly altering* the landscape of facts).

The complication is, of course, that declaring a "prediction" is also a mild form of "assertion", since it is a triggering of the corresponding pattern. *This-means-that.*

[...]

> Our beliefs are our reality.

You'll really have to define "beliefs" there. What are beliefs, *exactly*? It's an old magickal and new age idea that beliefs influence reality (really: experience). But I think it's probably confusing to say they *are* reality, since beliefs are typically interpreted as being personal. And when we say that people have beliefs that they are not aware of, that they are very deep inside, that starts to push against the common notion of "belief" - and it starts to sound more like "ingrained habit".

I would rather say: *patterns* are our reality. And what we can change is which *patterns* contribute to our experience, and to what degree they contribute. We might think of those patterns as *facts* which can be more or less prominent in our experience. Because people do sometimes believe things, and then they don't happen.

This approach also removes the problematic concept of "believing" being something you can *do*.

I'm not sure I'm a subscriber to anything! I wouldn't agree with his idea of processes or machines (as it were). If you strip back what he's saying, I'd say it amounts to: when you add one pattern to another (or even the same pattern to itself, the result is still a single pattern, but of greater complexity.

Well, the way I describe this to myself is, we have two loose "laws", which are actually versions of the same thing, relating to intentional shifts. Let me bash out a quick summary and see if it makes sense:

- *Observation Accumulation* - When we experience observing something, that observation and the facts that it implies become "defined". The contribution of that pattern to experience is intensified going forward.
- *Law of Coherence* - The world is a single pattern, and must always remain self-consistent as a whole. Here, we might define the world as the "relative distribution or contribution of patterns or facts" to ongoing experience.

This tends to lead to both an increase in complexity and an increase in habit as time (or development of *The Now*) continues. Somewhat counterintuitively, habits leads to complexity, because complexity requires persistence of patterns and superposition of patterns.

The question for us becomes: in this relentless "fixing" of the world, the ongoing tendency for things to become more defined, how can we introduce novelty? If we cannot, then what we're really dealing with is a fully deterministic pattern that can never be redirected. Can we, in effect, revise previous fixings? I say: yes.

I suggest:

- All facts already exist and they exist eternally. All that changes is the relative intensity of those facts, their level of contribution to ongoing experience. This distribution of facts is "the world".
- Novelty amounts to a deliberate shift in the relative distribution of patterns or facts.
- Intentional acts are how we introduce such a change.

Every intentional change, then, amounts to a shift in the world-pattern, which corresponds to a fresh deterministic experiential path, which permits until the next intentional shift. The mystery of this is, we cannot experience things before we experience them, in terms of the senses, so we cannot anticipate fully the extended patterning that follows from our intentions.

[...]

Why would belief matter, do you think? What exactly *is* "expectation"? So, you go outside and walk to the store. To what extent are beliefs and expectations causing what you experience?

The two ideas perhaps come from a sense of separation between you and the world. If the world is a pattern (the "world-pattern") which arises in the mind as an experience, then only things which adjust the pattern will influence the world. I can expect things and then they don't happen, since expectation can be along its own line of thought, rather than coming from the world-pattern.

Yes, so just for illustration think of it as two strands of thought happening at once:

- The vivid, 3D-immersive thought of the world.
- The other thought you have in your mind.

If your "belief" or "expectation" is just happening in the other thought, then it has minimum influence. If has to be *about* the 3D-immersive world thought. It has to actually be a *fact* in the world-pattern. I think many problems with trying to direct our experience amount from not *truly* committing to interacting with the world-pattern directly, but instead thinking *about* it in parallel. What you have to do is *know*, and the way to know is to directly update and for it do be *definite*.

[...]

When you "summon the feeling of the wishful fulfilled" you are triggering that pattern (the feeling) plus its implied facts (the thing that you want), such that it is overlaid upon the world-pattern and will appear in the senses when a context becomes available.

To expand - When imagining with intention, there is an important difference between *thinking-from* something (as it if were happening now) and *thinking-about* it (really, conceptualising it in parallel).

If you think in terms of the imagination room. In this room, whatever you create becomes activated and will become part of future experiences:

- If you think *about* something (separate, contained thought), then that is like creating a little bubble in the room, in which an image of your desire appears. Later, you experience your desire, but only as an image "over there", in a photograph or you see someone else with it. In other words, in the same form as you triggered it.
- If you think *from* something (3D-immersive thought), then that is like changing the whole room into an experience of the desired situation. Later, you experience your desire, but in this case as a 3D-surround image - as a person having an experience of being *in* the situation, rather than viewing a representation *of* the situation.

Does that make sense? Think of a car right now. Where is that car thought in space? Somewhere over there, or maybe floating in your head area somewhere. Now 3D-immersively imagine actually being in the car. That's the difference.

The reason "summoning the feeling of the wish fulfilled" is potentially powerful, is because *you can only do this immersively*. You can't create a feeling, and not be experiencing it "as if it were already happening" - therefore you inevitably associatively trigger situations which would imply that feeling, and therefore imply the fact of having obtained your desire.

Reply to “Playing with theory here..”

You're essentially asking the "is the world a single shared place?" question.

There are lots of ways to approach that, but skipping the ins and outs: in general I'd simply say that you should always think of things from your own 1st-person perspective, what something is like within *your* experience, and that means you must dismiss thoughts about what other people are experiencing as "out of bounds". One model you could use (as a replacement for the "single shared spatially-extended place unfolding in time" description of the world), would be to think of the world as an infinite toy box of all possible patterns and experiences, from which you are selecting your sensory moments as a "private copy" of the world.

From this perspective, if your girlfriend were to jump then you would describe this to yourself not as "my girlfriend jumped and her life changed" but rather than "I had an experience of my girlfriend jumping and reporting changes in her life". To ponder: how could you distinguish between *your girlfriend* jumping to an new experience and telling you, and *you* jumping to a new experience in which your girlfriend reported jumping? In other words, if you have control over your own experience, and your girlfriend is a part of your experience, then your girlfriend jumping is actually *your* experience *of her*, and it is meaningless to talk of it being *her* experience.

Reply to “I want a serious answer to what happens to other people after a "jump"”

There are no "other people". In a sense, there is no *you-as-person* either, so there are no "people". There is just *you-as-experiencer*, having "taken on the shape of" an experience, "as if" you were a *person-object* in a *world-place*.

Note, though, that *you-as-experiencer* is not a "thing" or an "object" or even a "perspective", which means there is not **an** experiencer, nor **many** experiencers. Really, there is just "experiencing". Another way to phrase this is that there is only *you-as-awareness*, or that the only fundamental truth is the fact of the property of "being-aware" or "awareness". Everything else is a relative, secondary, temporary truth only (hence we say we have an experience "as if" something is true). Although at first glance it might seem "ridiculous and morbid", that's usually because you are viewing it as a concept, which involves relating mental objects within a conceptual space. This is "before" that sort of division and explanation. Hence, the subreddit ends up being about exploring both the "nature of experiencing" and also the nature of *descriptions*. This - experiencing - cannot be conceptualised, because it is not made from "parts", and conceptual thinking is in fact an experience *of* or *as* it (metaphorically: "within" it, but it has no "outside" so that can be a bit misleading). It is not "morbid" because the "aliveness" of any experience is essentially sort of borrowed from this, directly, although it is not *located* anywhere. All of which is why the answers given to these sort of questions tend to be abstract, and irritating. (See also the metaphors given in the sidebar, as other ways into this.)

> > Well, you can frame anything any which way. But the reality is - and the one I hope everyone is working on - certain people experience sadness, pain, etc. and we feel sympathy with them, because they are the ones affected, not us. People can choose to cause this sadness and pain in others, or not choose that. That's how we judge someone's character. Emotions are real, and so is causing them, and separation from them.

Well, you can look at it that way if you want, for sure, but it's not especially supported by direct experience once you start attending to it and digging into things.

Now, to be clear: it's not so much that I'm saying that "people" aren't "real" in *any* sense, but rather that the concept of "people" as commonly understood in the default view is incorrect. (Here, the default view being that you are a *person-object* in a *world-place*, where "the world" is assumed to be a "stable, simply-shared, spatially-extended 'place' unfolding in 'time'".)

The outcome isn't that you perceive other people as just "stuff" to not care about - that "ridiculous and morbid" conclusion you refer to. Quite the opposite, in fact. All "people", including the apparent *you-as-person*, are structures within *you*. They are not "people" as in "separate beings", but it's actually more intimate than that: they are are all aspects of *you-as-being* or *you-as-awareness* (or "beingness", if you like).

You might say (although again this can be slightly misleading), that the choice to "cause this sadness and pain in others" would be a choice to cause sadness and pain *within yourself*, even though you might not experience it in a direct "unpacked" form. You would still be modifying the world (as enfolded within "awareness") such that it was patterned with "sadness" and "pain" - and quite possibly in a way that *would* then later unfold within unpacked sensory experience, from the perspective of apparently being a person.

It's not (intended to be) just "framing", this, I should stress. It is directly observable to be the case that you are not a person in the usual sense, and nor is "anyone else". It follows from direct experience, and the philosophical discussion follows from that.

> So if I choose to embark of a journey of large jumps, I could not feel at ease that "I've always been jumping infinitely". There would be something fundamentally different about doing it with a type of intent I never tried to use before. People can call it Magic, Playing God, whatever.

Well, the "I've always been jumping infinitely" view has problems in any case, and would not in fact ease your mind if you went into it more deeply.

Luckily, though, the "meta" view circumvents this anyway - the "meta" view being the recognition that all experiences are "shapings" from, or *states* of, this "experiencing" (or "awareness"). And so, again, *all* experiences are on an "as if" basis only. That is, they are "patternings" of *you-as-awareness*.

Which means there is only one type of intent! "Intending" is equivalent to "increasing the prominence of a particular pattern within your state", where your "state" corresponds to the full definition of the world within you and the fully-determined sequence of sensory moments which follow from that. If you intend the outcome of "it is true *now* that my arm will move *now*" then that is the same in *type* as the outcome "it is true *now* that I will ace my exam *then*".

Aside - Note that you are not - necessarily - intending or shifting "all the time", in this description. Only when you redirect unfolding experience, or deliberately assert or imply something, are you doing that. This can be tricky to articulate, because of course intention is "outside of" time, since time is itself a patterning within and a formatting of state. In particular, "intending" is not the same as the experience of apparently "doing something". The experience of "doing" is *itself* a result, a sensory experience that is an aspect of the current state. (Which of course means you never actually experience "causing" anything.)

Calling things "magic" or "playing god" is merely an artefact of a particular intentional outcome being exceptional in the context of the standard *description*, rather than it being exceptional in the context of *experience-as-it-is*. There is no "magic", there only just "patterning" (your current state) and "intention" (the intensification of a pattern and therefore a reshaping of your state).

Ultimately, though, none of this matters. If you recognise that there are only experiences, and descriptions *of* and thoughts *about* experiences are *themselves* just more experiences (at the same "level"), then you are left with merely: a) attending to the nature of the current moment directly, b) experimenting to see the extent to which you can alter it. And stories you come up with *about* that are actually not particularly relevant or true - other than as formattings that you can use to formulate your intentions, and therefore the extended patterns associated with your target outcomes.

> There are people who devote their whole lives to occult and insist on performing unethical rituals in their practice.

Because they seem to be true. Why?

In short: "patterning".

Now, although "patterning" is itself a metaphor, it is meant to offer an example of the most minimal description that captures the fact of "experience is apparently structured". The implication of "patterning" and "intention is the increasing of one pattern's contribution to your ongoing experience" is that:

- Whatever you intend *in terms of*, will seem to be true, because it will result in experiences "as if" that were true.

And now:

> Why not just choose another way to intend?

There is only ever one way to intend - or actually it is not even a "way", because intending is actually not a "doing" or "technique" or "mechanism" at all. It might be better describe as a "self-shaping" (of *you-as-awareness*). But you can intend any pattern, and any pattern you intend also includes its extended associations. Any intention is, sort of, a shift of the entire world-pattern, *in terms of* the larger meanings associated with the intention.

But you might not know this, particularly if you only pay attention to the *content* of particular experiences and don't notice the *context* of all experiences - and if you think that your apparent actions are "causal" rather than also being "results" (of intention, which is the only cause).

Now, I realise the above might sound a bit abstract, so: More specifically, then: if you intend an outcome in terms of "the Norse gods", then in addition to your outcome you will also tend to bring about an increase in the pattern "the Norse gods exist", because it was implied by your intention. If you aren't aware that there is this "meta" perspective of viewing such things - and perhaps you haven't also intended in terms of other things - you will likely become convinced that "the Norse gods" are real in an independent way, and the evidence will stack up more and more as you intend in terms of them. After all, you are *literally* experiencing the truth of their existence! Furthermore, if you are performing certain rituals, then you might think that they, too, exist as real mechanisms, because you are having experiences "as if" they are true (even though in actual fact "performing a ritual" is just yet another experience, an aspect of your current patterned state, as is any seeming outcome). "Anything goes", but it only "goes" if you intend accordingly - and until you intend in terms of something, there might be zero evidence of that something! Although having said that, it tends to be the case that intentional thinking *about* a thing tends to lightly pattern your ongoing experience with that thing - see synchronicities, for example, or the *Owls of Eternity* exercise linked in the sidebar.

[...]

Yes, it's really hard to put into language, so we end up going at it from multiple angles and, we hope, the combination of all of those then points to the thing we actually mean. I think it's perhaps helpful do away with the whole idea of "projection", though, since that still implies there's an activity taking place, from one object onto another.

So, two possible approaches that occur for talking around the subject:

First, stick to what you *actually experience* and make a distinction between that and what you *infer*.

One observation along those lines: your ideas about "other people" to some extent are due to what you see in the mirror, and "other people" also being that shape and with those movements and so on. Since you experience yourself as having thoughts and ideas, you might map that onto other people. However, your

thoughts are not actually experienced as being *in the world*. There is the *person-in-world* image, and there is thoughts. Your *you-as-person* experience isn't what is thinking, really; that's just content. Rather, the thoughts are appearing in the *you-as-awareness* experience *alongside* the *person-in-world* experience.

Another: going back to that mirror experience, perhaps consider what you *actually* look like, your actual experience. Is that the image in the mirror? If you think so, why do you think so? If it isn't, what do you look like really?

Second, and following on from that, consider that the world is a single continuous pattern, a "world-pattern", one that is static but fully defines the world and all possible experiences associated with it, in a given state (until it is shifted via intention to a new state, occasionally). The sensory experience you have, then, is the "sensory aspect" of that world-pattern, unfolded from a particular perspective, for a particular series of moments. ("Time passing" is also a static pattern, in this description.)

This pattern is not a *projection*, then, and is more like a "shape" you have adopted. The full definintion is "enfolded" within you, with sensory moments "unfolded" within you in sequence. It follows that all "people", including the "person" you are apparently experiencing being, are patterns which are aspects of this world-pattern. They are all "alive" in the sense of being "made from" awareness; but they are not themselves aware. They are not experiencing. Rather, awareness is *aware of them*, as them, since awareness *is* the pattern including all the people-patterns. Only "awareness" is experiencing (and "awareness" is itself really a synonym for "experiencing" or the fact of experiencing).

Here we must be careful not to conflate "experience of" with "expanded as a sensory moment". Right now, *you-as-awareness* is experiencing being the entire world-pattern, even though only this particular *person-in-a-world* moment is unfolded as a spatially-extended sensory aspect. The language we use to describe a particular everyday experience can be a bit misleading here, because it's all quite course-grained and in terms of particular objects. If you actually attend to your ongoing experience directly, it's much more subtle than that: you experience "meaning", and I'd say the sense in which you experience being the world-pattern is like experiencing "meaning".

Anyway, those are a couple of avenues worth exploring. As always, though, we're invoking metaphors or arranging concepts in order to describe something which is actually super-simple: experience just *is*, with nothing behind it. Although: we must also consider the observation that adopting particular concept tends to shape experience accordingly. Which loops back to, say, the idea that adopting directly or implicitly the concept of "an external person who can make their own choices" is effectively a patterning of your own experience (your world-pattern or state) such that it is shaped "as if" that were true.

[...]

Part One

> there aren't many "people" on here who enjoy exchanging several paragraph long posts.

It's tricky sometimes. To discuss this topic properly usually requires a bit of back and forth before we even get going - since we need to work out what exactly one commenter means by a particular phrase versus another, and there's a need to provide context for most things, rather than snappy one-liners.

I personally try to encourage deeper thinking and discussion throughout the sub, but it's very time-consuming for people to have that sort of conversation, particularly when a lot of time has to be spent describing, for example, "why what you say isn't *wrong*, but is *meaningless* from a different perspective, and here is the other perspective", and so on. Anyway -

> Yes, the term projection can be convoluted, though the way I use it has changed from the past, so when I use it now I mean "you're seeing your own choice", basically.

Right. The issue with "projection" is that it tends to imply a sort of mechanism which occurs within time and space. But what you mean is clear enough.

Using a different metaphor, then, we might say that "seeing your own choice" is the "sensory aspect" of your current state - which one might consider as the total sum of all deliberate and non-deliberate intentional patterns and their implications to date, and which fully defines all moments. Your state or world-pattern is itself non-local and non-temporal, implicitly specifies all locations and moments. In this scheme, "projection" would be "intentional change of your state and subsequently encountering the effects in your ongoing experience".

> I've been paying extra attention in my dealings with "other people" lately and I have been able to really see the lack of separation between experiencing and the seeming appearance of others, so I now view these interactions as less real which helps to examine exactly what I'm patterning.

I wouldn't say that they are "less real" though. The only thing that was ever real was your ongoing patterned experience, and the only way in which you ever encountered people was as a part of that experience. It's simply that your *story about* that experience has changed. The *description* has changed, but the *nature of the experience* is unchanged from what it was before.

However, by attending to your experience you can directly notice that it is all "made from you" - that is, that you are and always were the entire moment of any particular scene or encounter. And although the scene is structured as apparently being from a certain perspective - *you-as-person* are apparently "over here" and your friend is "over there" - you notice that the whole thing, both "over here" and "over there" and everywhere else, is in fact "made from" you. So you are everywhere and nowhere; it is all actually *you-as-awareness* in the "shape" of the scene.

> I have a twin brother and it's harder to see his lack of independent existence due to our history...

That experience of identity and history - that meaningful *felt-sense* - that accompanies experiences of your twin, *is itself* experiential content. You can actually locate it somewhat within experience usually (it may be in your lower abdomen area, or in your chest). It's something to play with, anyway, the meaning that comes with the other aspects of a scene or moment.

> When I look in the mirror lately, it is more like I am looking at a dream, so whatever I'm looking at isn't as solid as I thought before.

The key here, I think, is to notice that the image is "over there", and then to direct your attention to "the place your are looking out from" and see what's there. Ultimately, you probably first get the sense that the mirror isn't a reflection of you, it's part of the visual scene, and that in the other direction is a sort of void (*not* a space,

usually). Then - as with the *Feeling Out Exercise* in another link - you notice that the whole scene is sort of floating within perception, and you can explore beyond the boundaries of that.

Your body is a bunch of sensations floating and phasing in and out; you do not experience "being a body" as such at all. (Although occasionally you may *think* it.) Really pay attention to the boundary between "your body" and "the room". Is there, in fact, actually a boundary? In what way are you "inside" your body at all? And so on.

As you point out, one might ask whether there is a "literal person who is angry" when dealing with others. But similarly, it is worth asking if there is a "literal person who is angry" when *you* are having the experience of being angry. There may be a bunch of sensations, and thoughts, and so on - but if you try and locate a "you" who is angry, you'll struggle to find one.

> Some people may say that if you're just experiencing your own patterns/ideas of the world, then certainly you could just go around abusing people without consequences - how accurate would you say that is?

There are always consequences, just because making a change involves corresponding consistent changes simply as part of shifting a pattern (in this metaphor). However, you could then address any unwanted outcomes as they arose, so in that sense you could do it "without consequences". Even outside of this topic, it's true you can do all sorts of bad things without suffering later, even if you do it in the everyday sense.

But it's a bit like punching yourself in the face and then using magic healing cream. Why do it?

> It's not something I want, I'm just curious as to if there's any limitation.

No limitation, structurally.

> My view on it is that it's not possible, only because if you talk in terms of "abuse" or needing to steal from other people, then you're implying that you couldn't be given those things or you're implying that there are other people or resources outside yourself.

I think you can always handle and circumvent these implications though - that is, intentions which imply a world in which you don't get your outcome - by stepping back from them and changing the context.

> Instead of stealing money and getting away with it, you would just be given money or acquire it through some other means, for example.

That does seem a better route.

Part Two

> In regards to world patterns, I can see now that my previous idea of thinking that there ... is just a pattern and not something primordial; certainly having a perspective of life being amazing and jumping out of bed everyday in ecstasy isn't anything more special other than just being a different pattern.

It's "patterns all the way down", then!

Which, I we discussed earlier I think, is simply a way of saying that the only thing that is fundamentally true is the fact of "awareness" or *being-aware*, and absolutely everything else is relatively and temporarily true only.

This doesn't just apply to facts of the world, but to the formatting of experience more generally (even "spatial extent" and "things change" and "objects" and "seeing" are patterns, just more abstract). Generally, then, one should consider that all possible patterns exist eternally, always present now in the background, and what changes is their relative prominence or intensity of contribution to ongoing experience (with a particular distribution of intensities being your "state").

So no experience is more special or fundamental than any other experience, because the fundamental aspect is common to *all* experiences. Being depressed is an experience, as is ecstasy. And you don't need any *reason* to experience one or the other, because there is no cause within experience. You experience something because it has been patterned in; that is all. Intention is the only cause, and all experiences and apparent events are *results*, as aspects of your current patterned state. For example, you could simply decide right now to feel joyously happy and, if you don't interfere, it'll happen. In fact, try that right now: *just decide* that you are going to feel really bright and happy - and then allow whatever happens to happen.

> [if I am formless awareness] where does the "personal view of the universe" idea come in? For example, if I'm talking to my neighbor, is there no experience as if my neighbor is talking to me?

You could rephrase it, perhaps. If *you-as-awareness* has taken on the shape of a world-pattern, and in addition adopted the fact of *being-this-person*, then your experience will be consistent with that.

Now, if *you-as-awareness* modified that and instead adopted the fact of *being-this-neighbour*, then your experience would change accordingly. What would such an experience be like? Have you already had that experience, perhaps? Or, taking this further, if all possible patterns exist eternally, what does it mean to ask whether you "have had" or "will have" the experience of apparently *being-this-neighbour*?

> Since I never experience anyone else' perception of me, I guess this is all theory and speculation, so perhaps it isn't important, so long as "I am the one in control of everything I experience" is seen and understood clearly.

As you say, wording get tricky. Because of course, the "me" you are referring to there doesn't experience anything at all; it's just a pattern. Only *you-as-awareness* ever has an experience, because it *is* "experiencing", and so "me" is a experience, not something that experiences. So the "you in control of everything" is also, strictly speaking, an experience. You could have an experience "as if" there is a "you" who controls everything, or not. However - and this is really what you are going for here I think - the experience of apparently being "you who controls everything" is always available, potentially.

> I have started to adopt the pattern of "I'm the only one in control" a lot more and it has taken a lot of responsibility that I had put outside of myself, so I suppose the pattern will continue to get stronger and I can explore more how far I can take it.

Right, it's a pattern, and the more you intend in terms of it, the more prominent it will become. And as you imply, there *is* no "outside of yourself" anyway, because there is no "outside" or "behind" to experiencing.

If awareness is metaphorically "rippled" with patterns and there is no "granularity" to awareness, then there are no theoretical limits to what can be adopted. While one can directly notice the fact that the fundamental nature of experiencing - and of descriptions about experiencing, which are themselves just experiences - is "awareness", and even have experiences of "void" which feel like infinite potential directly, ultimately these limits (or lack thereof) are left as a matter for "personal" exploration.

Really, I'd suggest, that actually becomes an investigation of your current patterning, as every intention implies its extended pattern and results in a shift in terms of your current state - presenting a new landscape to explore. This, in fact, is why a "seeker" can never find "enlightenment" via knowledge and experiences; because the experiences never end, and they have implicitly intended by "looking" to always end up "finding" - forever. But if we consider the stuff we've been talking about about, the "meta" of all experiences, this has already been removed as an issue, and now we're just having fun.

Reply to “Jumping questions”

> But if there's a single world then opposing wills will compete.

That would only be true if a "world" corresponded to "a population of independent people in a shared spatially-extended place unfolding in time". That is not necessarily the case, and in fact is an assumption that falls apart under the scrutiny of experimentation and contemplation. There are other metaphors one can use instead. For example, one might instead consider "*the* world" to be a shared resource of patterns, from which everyone constructs or implies their own "private copy" of *a* world.

Reply to “A few questions.”

I guess probably the best way to start, is to ponder:

- How, *exactly*, does the "law of attraction" work? (And what is the model of the world upon which it's based?)
- What are "you" and what is your relationship to "the world"?

As the sidebar says, "dimensions" are really just a concept or metaphor (as indeed is the concept of "reality"), one that is used to describe an experience and/or formulate an intention. It is not really "how things work" or "how things are". (In fact I'd suggest there *is* no "how things work", and "how things are" cannot be described because descriptions themselves are made from it.)

Ultimately, then, this is about generating experiences which lead one to contemplate the "nature of experiencing", and understand the relationship between experiences, intentions, and descriptions. And getting some desirable results along the way, for sure. The Two Glasses exercise, specifically, is really a structured approach to getting someone to shift state from one with "this" pattern as dominant, to one with "that" pattern as dominant - whilst making it relatively unlikely that they will counter-intend it afterwards, and in a way that naturally raises questions about causal relationships within experience.

Reply to “Logical question”

> I also thought - if all the dimensions are not really parallel lives but probabilities, why bother 'changing dimensions' if you can change something in THIS dimension with the same effort? For example, what is the point of jumping into the dimension where you never had a disease (and mess around with the timeline), when you can (theoretically) eradicate it here?

It's just an enabling metaphor to let you have (near-)instantaneous change. It's probably better to say they are like "parallel dreams" rather than possibilities. I can be easier to conceive of detaching from one situation and attaching to another, than it is to convincingly argue how "dissolving disease" would work.

Sometimes the mystery aspect is what helps things along.

> I see it as changing the settings :-) once you change them, you can see how it is reflected around you.

Ha, yes, nice metaphor. :-)

I see it as updating or inserting new *facts* into the world. With the understanding that the "sharing model" of the world means it's basically mine to play with, and everyone gets a similar influence. Ongoing sensory experience then spontaneously falls into line with the updated facts.

> BTW, talking about settings reminded me of the Hawaiian (allegedly) ho'oponopono technique - that would actually fit better on Oneirosophy, as its premise is that reality is internal, so if you want to change anything around you, you need to find a corresponding thing INSIDE you, and change that.

Yes, I've played with it! Essentially, it's about dissolving/overwriting troublesome aspects of yourself with the feeling of love/forgiveness. A book called *Busting Loose From The Business Game* has a similar approach based on "reclaiming your power" from events as they arise. My own generalised version turned into this *Overwriting Yourself* post. I guess it makes sense that we should all be talking about basically the same thing. In effect: digging around in the background for facts we don't like, then deleting them!

I'd go so far as to say *everything* is inside you - even the room and situation you are experiencing right now - because you have no outside. The sensory experience is just a perceptual mirage floating in awareness - a partial slice of the *real world*, which is the world of facts dissolved into the background.

> There is (or used to be) a similar ideological premise in traditional psychoanalysis

Jung played with "Active Imagination" which basically does this. I think it is very much out of favour now (if it was ever really in favour). These days it's all about semi-mechanical tools such as Cognitive Behaviour Therapy - they focus on activity rather than meaning. Which is a major error really.

> That is also why I commented that jumping dimensions seems (to me) as merely a functional narrative...

I think you are exactly right: you are dreaming-imagining your experience.

Which means you are 'First Cause' for everything around you. But people find that difficult to get to grips with - "okay, now what do I *do* with that? how do I make things happen?" - because you cannot experience the making of changes. You *are* the change. To make a change is to *take on a new shape*, meaning there's a shifting of self but no "doing".

So we invent 'Second Causes' or 'enablers', whether they be technological tools to make the changes on our behalf, or *active metaphors* such as "dimensional jumping" or whatever.

In all cases, it is *we* who make the changes directly. When we use a tool or technique, the tool is a result on the same level as the outcome. We cause them both; the whole story of "using this to make that happen" is our creation.

Extra thought: This problematic thinking is everywhere. For instance, people try to fix their posture by training muscles and pushing one bit versus another, etc. But your posture *is* the arrangement of you. There are no "parts" to posture. The only way to have better posture, better shape, is to re-shape as a whole. To... *shift*.

I think *sleeping with intent* works quite well (and I'd see that movie). Which makes sense in this overall scheme - sleeping and dreaming is an opening of attention, a loosening of your hold on current patterns to let them shift.

One time, I had completely screwed up at work, and took the day off sick when I had the corresponding presentation. I slept/dreamt through that day and "deleted" it. I went into work after the weekend, and the project was never mentioned ever again. Good appraisals, etc.

> It's like you narrowly avoid something, like you don't jump - from a lack of a better comparison - too far. The potentially negative situation is still there, but sort of behind a curtain, and you avoid it, but it's better not to talk too much about it, and - I discovered - better not to remind people of this other version of events. It is sort of like they know, but they don't at the same time.

Right. As I like to think of it, it's like you've changed some of the *facts-of-the-world*. Afterwards, people's natural spontaneous actions and thoughts arise from these updated *facts*. If you push them, it's like there's still a memory of the old ways - however they aren't seeding the current world.

But I'd say the old memory was *your* old memory.

My thinking is that the fact you can push them on this at all is because you know you made the change, basically. And by probing them, you are getting back your own doubt on the matter. Implicitly, by questioning them you are brining the old *fact* back into existence. Meanwhile, if you had made a change but you had no idea you were responsible - e.g. a strong imagining of a change in a daydream - you'd probably experience this as some sort of Mandela Effect type deal, and just be very confused that nobody could remember what you do.

> I am not sure - I sometimes think there are those twilight situations, when you stil have one leg in one world - so to speak - and another in a different one, and for a moment both are possible. Or maybe I think of soemthing else entirely, but cannot identify it correctly.

I agree with that. Hmm. The fact that you would entertain the previous history means you have not fully committed to the new facts. If you did - they wouldn't remember. But then how would you tell? Whatever version you try to investigate, that's what you'll get back!

You (as in, everyone) should experiment with the synchronicity thing. You will directly experience that the world reflects your firm opinion - or your indecision.

The personal experience is more like a dream which operates on an "as if" basis. If your worldview is fuzzy about certain things, then the evidence you encounter appears fuzzy or contradictory also. That's why I think we need to *definitely decide* what's going to happen regardless of current sensory evidence, rather than start with the evidence and try to "work out what to do" or what is possible.

[...]

> [Q: I was thinking of an example, but nothing comes to mind ... it would be a situation which is weighing, with different outcomes open, and suddenly everyone goes blind to one of these options, somehow as it is not supported ... I am not sure how to phrase this. The only example I can think of (which is not perfect, but maybe you will understand what I mean) is when I broke my toe and suddenly everyone got blind to this. I was mentioning it (and whinging), but it was like noone could hear it, or noone remembered it. I was quite upset when I had to remind my parents that I had a broked toe, but it was like it was going over their head. It did heal quickly and with no problems, but I discovered that sometimes when this is happening it is not good to push this, and just let it flow. EDIT: it is like the broken toe didn't belong to the timeline, or something (?). Silly example, I know. I am not sure if I made myself clear (and I apologise for my English, which is not my first language)]

Reminds me a little of this story:

> *Changing the Past, Cindy - Cooperstown, New York*
>
> Several years ago I was walking through the woods and I fell. As I tumbled downhill, I heard awful sounds coming from my knee and ankle. I remember thinking that my knee was shattering. When I stopped rolling, I immediately put my hands up towards my leg to start a healing process, saying over and over in my mind frantically, "back in time, back in time."
>
> It was getting dark, so after five minutes or so, I pulled myself up to the main path so I could be found. If I had stayed where I was maybe my ankle would have healed completely right away. When I got to the top, I started the healing again. Perhaps at that point it was for my sanity. I had just finished my second chemo treatment, and I was determined to stay focused on not taking on anything else. Since then, a guide of mine has helped me see the big picture, and I've learned that it's very interesting what we can and will do to get a merit badge, or should I say Spirit Badge! ~@:)
>
> The paramedics told me that it was probably just a sprain. I know they didn't think that I was in pain, because I was calm and quiet, but on the inside I was screaming with pain... yet focused on reversing what had happened. In the Emergency Room, I was told that I would probably have to have surgery on my ankle, because of the type of break it appeared to be. A few days later when I went to see the orthopedic doctor, he was looking at the x-rays and turned and looked at me with a puzzled look on his face. He said, "your ankle is broken in three places. It looks as though I had already set it ... they are aligned perfectly." I've often wondered if I had reversed a knee injury and had started on my ankle.

Reply to “Questions.”

> As banana said we are always jumping.

Do you actually think that? For instance, when you clean your teeth in the morning, are you *actually* intending to have cleaner teeth at that moment? Or is it that a previous intention is playing out in experience?

Which isn't to say that many people aren't regularly re-intending their state, basically thrashing about in reaction to things, but I'd say that most people are pretty much just "experiencing", plus non-deliberate resistance-based intention. And when they do intend, they perhaps do so incorrectly: for instance, they aren't intending to "have cleaner teeth", they are intending to "rub a brush against their teeth for an amount of time", which is different. Maybe the way to say this is: It *might* be true that you are always jumping, but you *shouldn't* be always jumping, because it is a misuse and misunderstanding of intention. It should be an occasional thing you do, in order to update your state (the current set of contributing facts), from which your subsequent experience will spontaneously arise.

> [Q: If I am understanding the gist of this post, is it basically saying....using effort for moment-to-moment actions is fruitless. Your experience plays out spontaneously from your "state", which is the relative intensity of each of the eternal set of "facts" or "patterns". So basically your experience is actually deterministic, however you could only know what would happen if you knew the exact distribution of facts (impossible). You can intend anything you can conceive of, so they can be quite abstract. Intentions can be non-specific with respect to time such as "I will see more owls" vs "I will see owls on Thursday".
>
> So basically you should update your state once in awhile, but otherwise trust your body (and by extension your world) to just make the correct spontaneous actions with no effort. So in the case of the cleaner teeth example, you should intend *once* that "I will have cleaner teeth" and your body will spontaneously do that from now on. You don't have to re-intend every time you brush your teeth.]

That's pretty much it, yes. If we think of our state as a metaphorical landscape, a pattern whose contours are equivalent to the current distribution (the relative intensities) of all pattern-facts, then any one particular configuration is a state which fully determines subsequent experience. To intend is to reshape ourselves into a new state, a new landscape, and a new fully-determined experiential set. The state should be thought of as *static* between those shifts; one should think of "time passing" as just another static component.

This is why it takes a certain amount of faith. You are always experiencing the full distribution of facts in total - that's what your current experience *is* - but you don't experience the facts individually. If you intend the content of a "future moment", then of course you don't experience that content until that moment; you can't "pre-experience" it as such. Only personal experimentation can give you confidence that: intention of pattern -> increased contribution of pattern -> subsequent experiences.

I guess the fundamental things to recognise is that, after you adopt a state, *sensory experiences happen by themselves*.

I'd probably suggest it's better not to call it a seed, since that implies a starting point and a generation process. Better, perhaps, to view the landscape is *pre-existing* and we only ever adjust it. Because it is a single pattern - like a blanket of material with folds within it - if we adjust one fact (tug on a fold) then just be doing that the

rest of the blanket is shifted somewhat, thereby maintaining logical coherence. The next step is to see it less as discrete folds, more as superpositions of patterns like moire fringes. Every possible pattern or fact is dissolved throughout the entire perceptual space, although some patterns have or *are* a spatial or temporal structure, with their relative intensity dictating the current overall pattern, or state. But all this, of course, is metaphor.

In fact, there is no inherent structure at all. All structure is "adopted" and is not fundamental.

Yeah, intention is a hard concept to grasp. Intention cannot be described, since it's really a shift in consciousness configuration. It is "before" division and multiplicity and change. It is "before" sensory experience or description. It is what experience and concepts are "made from". Really you grasp intention by... intending. However, one way around is to use synonymous phrases which capture the essence, such as: "assert that something is true", "think something is a fact", "intensify a pattern", "imagine-that a state exists", and so on. Meanwhile, the reason I say it is "static between shifts" is to highlight the difference between *changes in sensory content* and *changes in facts*. If your current state is the "list of relative facts" that are true, bearing in mind that these are the facts of The Now and that this is non-temporal and non-spatial, then this only changes by intention.

Of course, you might say that the shifting of attention across the metaphorical landscape counts as "jumping", but I think it's better to conceive of this as being a static pattern called "time passing", since it happens by itself. Most people would consider jumping to be a shift in the *quality* or *factual content* of experience, rather than just the scanning of attention. It also makes it easier to make sense of experiences whereby one releases one's attentional focus and perceives an Eternal Static Now. So to summarise:

- Our ongoing experience can be described as a static deterministic landscape + a pattern of "time passing".
- Intention is the means by which we reshape that landscape, and therefore the content of subsequent experience.
- We are able to do this because our true nature is that of an "open aware space" which adopts the shape of the landscape. In other words, we *are* the landscape, and the state of the world is in fact that state of ourselves.

In terms of "changing multiple patterns at once", it's a case of: no and yes. No, because of course the landscape is not really divided into individual patterns anyway, so you can only ever intend one pattern, because you are always redistribution the *entire* pattern. Yes, because you can intend absolutely any redistribution at all.

To be clearer: you don't need to know what patterns exist and what exactly you want to change, because *all* patterns exist anyway - if you can think of it, it exists. To think of what you want, is *already* to know what pattern you want to intend. The intention *is* the thinking of that pattern. But not: the thinking *of* that pattern (in the 1st-person unbounded), not the thinking *about* that pattern (in the 3rd-person constrained).

[...]

Okay, interesting. A lot of this stuff is about getting the language right, I think, and making sure we mean the same things by the same words. So, exploring that - How would you describe "intention", in that context? How would you define it? And in what sense is brushing your teeth an unintended jump?

> [Q: Yeah sorry. Intention as in a desired outcome. Applying it with action is a jump. In my own personal opinion this subbreddit isn't about switching to actual other dimensions, but rather manipulating our personal perception of this reality. For example two cup experiment. When doing this I create an environmental impact on my subconscious. It follows in accord by suggestion. I am rising above the outward manifestations of my own unintended thoughts. And our thoughts drive our actions. So I used brushing my teeth as a crude example of applying action to a specific intention. It is the same just on a smaller, physical scale. "Dimension shifting" to me is just a type of self hypnosis. I don't know man I'm just ranting by now. Don't listen to me go over to r/hypnosis they have some really great posts. Happy jumping]

For sure, it's not about literally entering dimensions, that is just an "active metaphor", a formatting pattern, for a dramatic change in experience (see sidebar).

However, if I was being picky, I wouldn't phrase it as being about personal perception of this reality either, since that assumes a reality "out there" that I am changing my attitude towards. There *is* no "out there", except as a sort of base field of possibilities, an "infinite gloop" from which I select my experiences. The world, then, is dissolved within the perceptual space that I directly experience myself to be, with my ongoing experience arising in accordance with the current state (relative distribution of facts) of the world. And rather than *self*-hypnosis, it would be more like *world*-hypnosis or *state*-hypnosis: changing your world-pattern by asserting truths.

So, I get what you were trying to say about the teeth-cleaning. I find it helpful to separate out intention from a physical or mental action, because they are not the same thing; you can intend without doing anything. An act in and of itself is just a sensory experience; it has no causal power. An act *can* be a benefit though, because it provides something to attach an intention onto, as a sleight-of-hand, declaring indirect facts and having our outcome happen by logical implication.

For example, with the two glasses exercise, rather than directly intending the situational change, we are implicitly creating the facts that the two glasses *are* the situation, the water *is* the intensity of the situation, and that pouring that water *is* a shift state. Overall, pouring the water *means-that* the situation changes.

So we have:

- Intention is an assertion of a fact, and:
- by extension, all facts which are logically implied by that fact are also asserted.

Reply to “Questions regarding DJ”

So, the real answer is that "dimensional jumping" and "law of attraction" are both aspects or artefacts or *leveragings* of a deeper truth. The difference between them is, I'd say, that "dimensional jumping" is *knowingly* employing this and understands there is no solid underlying "how things really work", whereas the "law of attraction" tends to be based on a hand-waving sense of there being a "how things are really". (And often a poorly-defined one, leading to almost superstitious behaviour in search of "vibrations" and the like.)

At root, though, they both work because change arises due to intentions and their implications - and the world-descriptions those intentions are structured in terms of - rather than due to a technique or method based on the world being a certain way independently of those intentions.

[...]

So the idea is that when you write the labels you contemplate the specific situation you are in, then contemplate the specific outcome you want, and in each case "feel out" the words that capture those situations (that is, you let the words come to you rather than logically working them out). There's no reason for anything more dramatic to happen, other than what makes sense in terms of "this" turning into "that". You're not going to some other drastically different place, you're just tweaking up your current experience a bit by "re-patterning" it (is the concept behind the exercise).

"Dimensional jumping" is just one of many metaphors which, the idea goes, you can use to generate experiences "as if" they were true. So, if you want radical change in your life, something that breaks the rules a bit, then constructing intentions in terms of that metaphor allows you to "re-pattern" your experience in a way that actions based on the usual world description would not. (Although there is also some misdirection involved to ensure that you don't resist, or later counter-intend, the outcome.)

Fundamentally, you never occupy *any* body, you just have an experience "as if" you are "a body within a world". The deeper observation referred to earlier, is realising that the *only* fundamental truth is the fact that there *is* an experience happening - that is, the fact of *being-aware*. The actual *content* of experience, though, is impermanent and has no solid underlying substrate, and hence the possibility of shifting its condition without limitation. (All of which, of course, should be checked by personal experimentation; you're not meant to take anyone else's word on this.)

At a fundamental level there are no people and you are not actually a person! Basically, don't worry about it - you can treat it like a "private copy" of the world where everything in your experience is an aspect of a larger you. As I say, the only thing that is *always* true is the fact of "awareness"; everything else is true on an "as if" temporary basis only. So there are no conflicts, because there is only ever *this* experience happening.

I don't think the idea of karma as in "judgement and payback" is valid. There are no inherent rules-based morality laws or an independent benchmark for appropriate behaviour.

There *is* karma in the sense of, if you "pattern" yourself with a particular outcome or a particular worldview - whether by intending it or doing something that implies it - then it will become prominent in your life. But that's not the same as "balance" or whatever. Rather, it's just what a "patterning" approach means by definition: you get what you assert plus the logical implications of that assertion - i.e. if you intend something then you are *also* intending a world in which that intention makes sense.

So, basically just do it. There is no morality or judgement outside of yourself, so it's up to you. The nature of "patterning" does imply a certain "do unto others (unto the world-as-experience) as you would have done to you", though, of course.

You could consider that the world is not so much a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time" as a "toy box of all possible patterns and experiences, from which we draw to create our 'private copy'". All possibilities, then, are present eternally (which means "outside of time" rather than "forever"), "dissolved" into the background.

However, that too is basically a metaphor which you can experience "as if" it were true, albeit a metaphor which gets closer to being completely inclusive. Again, only *being-aware* - or "awareness" - is fundamentally true (exists), however it can "take on the shape of" any experience "as if" it were true (exists). To summarise this view:

- What you truly are is "awareness", a sort of non-material "material" whose only property is *being-aware*, and which "takes on the shape of" experiences.
- The experience you have taken on the shape of right now is one of apparently *being-a-world-from-the-perspective-of-a-person*.

The problem we have when thinking about it is that our thinking is already pre-formatted into a "shadow sensory" shape. We cannot think of things which are "before" experience, *because thoughts are themselves are just experiences*. We have to be careful and not make the mistake of assuming *the-world-as-it-is* is of the same format as our sensory moments, since they are just a particular patterning themselves. This tends to inform our idea of what "to exist" means.

Generally, I'd say that everything exists as potentiality (enfolded), and the current sensory moment exists as actuality (unfolded). However, right now you are actually experiencing absolutely everything, and this is true always - however, different pattern-facts are just "brighter" than other pattern-facts (their relative contribution to this sensory moment is stronger). We might call the current relative distribution of pattern intensities our present "state".

Basically:

- Think of the situation now that you want to change. Pause and wait for a word to come up which feels like it fits as a summary of that situation.
- Think of the situation as you want it to be. Pause and wait for a word to come up which feels like it fits *for that*.
- Use those words for your labels.

Follow the instructions as they are written in these instructions. That's it!

The properties of the glasses don't really matter - although it's helpful if they are transparent to some extent so that you can see the water levels and so fully experience the pouring of the liquid. So don't worry too much about that.

Other things to consider: remember to follow the last instruction; generally allow a week or so for anything to become obvious; later, if no luck, perhaps consider whether you are someone who "holds onto themselves" in everyday life, do you "control" yourself moment by moment?

> What do we mean by "controlling", sorry for obvious questions but since english is not my main language (not even close to) somethings might be a little bit confusing to me.

It's not you - it's hard to put into words anyway! So, an example:

Sit in a chair. Now stand up. Does it feel that the standing up experience just "arises" and your body "moves by itself", or do you feel that you are "doing" the standing up? If you feel that you are "doing" it, can you identify what it is you do? Are you tensing muscles? Thinking intensely? Narrowing your attention down? Do you begin by re-asserting the fact of "sitting down" before you being targeting "standing up"? *None of that is required.*

Now, instead of doing anything about standing up, just let your attention be open and expansive in all directions (*don't* narrow down onto your body parts), and *just-decide* that your body will stand up: simply think "being-standing-up". And then don't interfere. Allow the experience of "my body standing up" to just arise and unfold in your awareness, by itself. Some people constantly "re-assert" their current body position and then use effort to overcome it, and they do the same with thinking, and in particular they "concentrate" their attention on the target of what they are doing. None of this is actually required (in particular, you don't need to narrow-focus on your target in order to intend it and have it happen), and what it tends to do is "fix" you in your current state, and prevent it shifting - in the example, like you are intending "being-sat-down" and "being-stood-up" at the same time!

> alright, i think I got the point, so how do we transfer that to 2 glasses? And by the way, how was this method discovered? i've been looking on google but there's only reddit threads, no other websites so im curious :p

In two ways. Firstly, when performing the exercise, simply perform the acts as described in the instructions, and don't "concentrate" or "focus" or in some way try to make anything happen. Secondly, in your everyday life work towards staying "open and spacious" and go about your tasks by *just-deciding* rather than "manually" moving yourself (body, thoughts, attention).

The exercise itself, I put it together when someone posted a question over at /r/glitch_in_the_matrix asking whether it was possible to deliberately create a "glitch" type experience.

It's probably best described as an *experiment* rather than a method. Its underlying purpose really is to trigger an experience that encourages a questioning of your assumptions, and perhaps thinking along a particular direction about the "nature of experiencing". Without that larger idea backing it, the ability to have conversations like this about it in a forum, it probably isn't very valuable.

I'll leave you to conduct your own experiments and check it out for yourself, but if you're interested: here is the original comment describing the exercise, and the first responses!:

I've got a couple of silly tricks that are good to try, which benefit from randomisation. I'll stick with the more obscure but easier to perform one for now. It'll sound odd, and it's not exactly an obvious glitch generator, but there's method in the apparent madness. Here goes:

- Choose a situation that you want to change, but one that you don't necessarily have much influence over.
- Decide clearly what the current situation is, and what the desired replacement situation is.
- Get two glasses.
- Get two bits of paper or labels.
- Fill one of the glasses with water.
- On the first label, write a word that summarises the current situation, and stick it to the filled glass.
- On the second label, write a word that summarises the desired situation, and stick it to the empty glass.
- With the two glasses in front of you, pause for a moment, and contemplate how your life is currently filled with the first situation, and empty of the desired situation.
- Then, when you're ready, pour the water from the first glass (the current situation) into the second glass (the desired situation), while really noticing the sounds and feeling and shifting of the water from one to the other.
- Sit back and see the glasses in their new state; allow yourself to take deep breath and feel relieved.
- Take off the labels, put away the glasses, carry on with your life.

The audience should feel free to try this one at home.

> [Q1: I tried this and it worked, and I'm really shaken up by it.]

Well then, you are therefore required to post details. (You can change identifying specifics if required.)

Additional: So now that you know, the important thing is to choose the situation wisely when you do it next time.

> [Q2: I go away for a couple of weeks, and I miss this! Is this a new development or have you been keeping it under wraps? In any case, excellent application. Why didn't I think of that?]

It's a natural extension of the patterning approach - covert assignment of meaning and relationship, minimal likelihood of rewriting. It's a sneaky way of getting people to assert a new fact without them being able to interrogate it. And I get to skip having to give a philosophy lesson with this!

[...]

> *[There is no morality or judgement **outside of yourself**]* yes there is - me

Hmm, you are not outside of yourself!

> > other people are because they are not directly me and do things I despise... judgement, see

But *you* are not "directly you" either. To despise them is simply to despise aspects of yourself, and for as long as you despise them, it'll persist...

> that's right, because by thinking about them, I am reinforcing that "pattern". so I have to "drop" them... but realistically, they're not going to just vanish; so there must be a need for a war or something

Drop "realistically" too, then...

Reply to “Is dimension jumping against the bible”

Neville Goddard, a New Thought teacher of the last century whose ideas overlap with this subreddit quite a bit, based his whole teaching on the content of the Bible. Early *Christianity* - that is, before it got absorbed into a collection of *organisations* whose interests are, shall we say, not always completely aligned with educating and improving the lot of their followers - was in fact full of this sort of thing. Some might even say that that was the *basis* of Christianity, and that the parables and instructions in the Bible were in effect a *guide to nature of reality* - metaphorical representations of aspects of the world and self and how they operate, rather than literal stories to tell you how to behave in society ("or else").

Basically, you've nothing to worry about.

Reply to “The paradox of 982?”

So, for the purposes of this, I pretty much take the philosophical idealist or nondualist view. Starting with our direct experience, everything arises in the mind - in the sense of an "open aware perceptual space" which has no apparent boundary. Pausing a moment and paying attention (as opposed to *thinking about* it), this is obvious. The only things you know for sure, in fact, is that you exist or are aware, and that you are aware of having an experience. And really, these collapse to the same thing. However, *this is not a personal experience*. The "person" aspect is something we infer from some of the experiential content. In truth, there is just "experiencing". Hence: this isn't solipsism; solipsism just becomes meaningless. There is no person, that's too "late" in the description, although we still tend to use the word "subjective" just to prevent ourselves thinking using the 3rd-person "view from nowhere".

What we have then, is:

- The *nature* of experience (open aware space).
- The *content* of experience (thoughts, sensations, perceptions).
- And perhaps: thoughts *about* experience (also experiences).

So there is no objective or subjective aspect to this, inherently. We immediately see that the "external objective world" is an idea, a conceptual container to which we assign a certain subset of experiential content.

And then: what, exactly, would it mean to have an "objective dimension"? One might have a shift in experience that is "as if" one had changed dimensions, according to one's own concept of what a dimension was, but you would never actually experience "dimensions". Similarly, you never experience "quantum states" or "gravity". They are useful abstractions, connective fictions.

And that's the fundamental position of the subreddit, perhaps:

- Observations dictate the permitted models or abstractions.
- Models or abstractions do not dictate the permitted observations.
- It is interesting to begin at an earlier point in the model of experience, prior to the "external objective world" concept, and explore its limits via personal experiment.

Reply to “Both methods”

Remember, you are not meant to be "making it happen". That part happens automatically. It's a "dumb" patterning mechanism. So doing multiple method simultaneously, and suggesting different possible paths - that's beyond your remit.

Your job is simply to make a firm decision about what your target state is, perform an exercise (which activates that target pattern so it's overlaid on subsequent experiences), and then don't interfere. Because the moment you do the exercise is the moment the change is made - your new deterministic trajectory is laid out before you - and then it's just a matter of waiting for the corresponding experiences to be encountered.

[...]

Okay, firstly remember that what matters is here is that *you* know what it is you want - you are not "sending a message to the universe" or anything like that. What you are doing is, finding the target state (which already exists) and connecting to it and shifting to it.

Which gives you an idea of how to word things: "I would like a better job" is the description of a state where you would *like* a better job (i.e. don't have one). "I have a great job" is the name of a state where you *have* that job.

What is important though, is that you pause and actually do access that state. This isn't difficult, mostly people do it automatically, but it's worth being conscious of it. Just pause now and think of something or someone you desire, but think of them being with you and what that would be like. When I say "think of", I mean in the sense of pausing and waiting for the feeling-sensation that would go with having them.

Now, this is something that *comes to you*, not something that you create. Typically this *felt-sense* appears in the mid-area of your body. Having this is the difference between just making images in your had, and actually having connected to the target state. All techniques are really based on accessing the target state in this way, and then manipulating it into being the dominant contributor to you experience going forward.

So for the *Two Glasses Exercise*, if someone was unemployed but wanted their dream job, their labels might say something like "unemployed" and "dream job". Or if it were a specific job, then: "journalist". The "contemplation" part of the exercise is meant to encourage you to pause and connect to how those situations feel, to the states they represent. This is why you don't need to write out a big description; the words are merely *handles* which you attach to the *actual states*.

Hopefully you can see that it doesn't matter how other people feel about you, or even where things supposedly are in the world. This is all about *states* which lead to *experiences*. In the same way as there are no people, places or objects behind the screen of your TV, there are no external people, places or objects behind the 3D-immersive sensory experience you are currently having about *being-a-person-in-a-world*.

In and of itself, I don't think passing doubt or belief are important, *except* in the sense that you attend to them and end up embracing the doubtful view (but that *is* what people tend to do). For the duration of an exercise, you have to - if not believe, then *commit*. Just like, I dunno, if you were lifting weights but didn't really think it was possible, you would even really dedicate yourself to it - you wouldn't fully intend the result.

The glasses exercise to some extent misdirects you with its form obviously being unrelated to the situation and outcome, so that you neither believe nor disbelieve, you just do it without really thinking it through, and probably don't give it much thought. That's why it's a good demo.

Once you *have* given it critical thought, however, you likely need to persuade yourself of a model that goes with the exercise, or go for a 'surrender' approach (accept that "the act is the fact"), so that you can commit again. Although I'd say: I've you've read Goddard and stuff on patterning, it should be easier now to see it as "state anchoring and triggering" in an "imagination space", perhaps?

If you can take all that on board, think of this moment as your super-flexible staring point, then take it from there - that's probably the way around this.

[...]

You don't really need to *forget*; you just need to not *interfere* and so end up re-intending things. It's actually pretty robust if you do the exercise with full commitment; after all, it is an actual state change.

Reply to “Base Patterns... "Shared?" patterns”

Scene Setting

I think I'll begin by just layout out the bare-bones description of our situation, so that we're all talking in the same terms, and then I'll focus on the points your raise in your post. So, we have something like:

- "Awareness" is the non-material "material" whose only inherent property is *being-aware*. This fact is the only thing that is *fundamentally* - that is, unchangingly - true.
- Because awareness is "before" division and multiplicity and change, awareness is not an object; it is not a thing. Awareness itself has no edges, and it makes no sense to talk about "**an** awareness" or "**the** awareness" or "**my** awareness"; it is simply "**awareness**".
- Awareness can take on the shape the 1st-person experience of *apparently* being a particular thing, however it is always actually *all* of the experience.
- All possible facts, patterns and experiences *already exist* - and can be thought of as being "dissolved" into this awareness.
- What you actually are, is awareness.
- Your current experience corresponds to the distribution of intensities of these patterns, their relative contribution to your overall *state*.

To illustrate this to themselves simply, anyone can close their eyes right now and try to:

- a) find the "edges" of your current experience,
- b) find where "you" are in your current experience.

What you discover is that, although you are apparently "over here" and the screen with these words on is "over there", actually you discover that you are "everywhere". Upon closer inspection you recognise that the whole experience is "made from you", and that there are no edges to this experience/you; there is no "outside" to your experience. It's worth emphasising here that the sense in which awareness "takes on the shape of" an experience is in the sense of a *1st person* experience. This is *not* saying that "the world is made from awareness" in the same sense as one might say "the world is made from atoms" - as a spatially-extended place "out there" with "you" in it. Rather, awareness takes on the shape of "sensory moments" which are aspects of a state, a state which corresponds to a particular dissolved "definition" of the world - a "world-pattern".

Therefore, it is meaningless to talk about space and time outside of experiences. And, in fact, your thoughts *about* such things are themselves experiences formatted in terms of spatial and temporal patterns. If you are imagining an outside of awareness or experience, you are immediately "wrong" and that imagining is "inside" awareness/experience.

Patterns & Pals

For this next bit, I'm not exactly sure what you were asking, to be honest - hopefully the outline above will help tease out any hidden assumptions there might have been, and we can better pinpoint where there might be a misunderstanding. In the meantime, though -

> it seems like there is a point where "base" patterns are defined and are not quite as easily controlled/altered/influenced via intent.

I think it can be helpful to outline some groupings, perhaps. The patterns that contribute to your current experience would include: base formatting (spatial extent, change), world formatting, general world facts, perceptual formatting, outcomes and event patterns, abstract patterns overlays, and so on - all giving one single resultant pattern or state. Here, the base formatting could be viewed as being the most intense or deepest of the patterns - we're basically talking about the abstract patterns that mean there is such a thing as apparent "division" and hence "objects". To stop having an experience in terms of that is difficult - a void experience - because everything you intend as an action will tend to further imply those patterns! Which leads us to an important point: Patterns become more dominant because either we intend them, *or* because our intention *implies* them. If you intend walking to the door, then that intention already implies the pattern of the room, the door, a body, plus spatial extent and temporal structure. In fact, one might say that every intention implies a whole world, because for an intention to have meaning at all, it must be part of an extended pattern, an entire context.

This is important to realise, because it flips our usual thinking around. It is not for us to examine the current world and then work out the best intention given that world - all we are doing, then, is re-asserting the current world. Rather, we select an outcome and *implicit within that intention* will be a world that has that outcome as part of its extended pattern.

> It seems that it would make sense that the base pattern is a composite/aggregation of the many shapes/experiences/patterns from awareness.

From the above, we have that all possible patterns already exist, and *any* state is an aggregate of *every* pattern, just at different levels of contribution.

> I don't think each pattern (me/you/others) would independently render/create all the content of experience for its entire private copy of the "universe".

First, "me/you/others" doesn't make sense in this context; there are no independent people at all. No person ever does anything. There is only "awareness" and it is the only power - which is, to reshape itself.

Secondly, that sentence implies that the world is "designed" - that facts are deliberately chosen. This is not the case. From a single intention, a whole apparent could be implied - that is, a sequence of experiential moments "as if" a world existed and you were a person in it. "Creation" is already done, remember; everything already exists. What is happening might be better termed as "recall" from a memory block, or associative thinking in the form of a strand of 3D-formatted multi-sensory thought. Meanwhile, there is no "mechanism" involved in this; nothing is "rendered". Intention is the only "mechanism" and is the only thing that ever truly happens. (See also: *The Hall of Records* for a metaphor of this type.)

Take the case of direct-entry lucid dreaming. You lie down comfortably, allow you body and mind and attention to release, wait patiently and passively until hypnagogic imagery begins: sparkles, shapes, image fragments, visual objects, eventually a scene appears, and then that scene pops into a 3D-immersive environment. From that single scene, that single 3D-immersive multi-sensory "frame" or "moment", an entire world is implied! For sure, it is based on the current relative distribution of abstract patterns active as your

state, however the dream world, in terms of its "facts", was never deliberately chosen or designed. And yet no matter how far you seemingly wander, that world will have no gaps or edges.

So it is, I suggest, with this experience you are having right now - this experience taking place "as if" you were a person in a world reading words on a screen.

[...]

> but these types of experiences are just mental exercises without any change actually occurring

What's a pseudo-experience? Redefining experience - e.g. standing as awareness *vs* standing as a person - is still a change in experience. An *actual change*. (For sure, you might like something more dramatic, but the conceptual scale of a change has nothing to do with the "size" of the actual change, which has no size at all.)

In fact, *that* shift is perhaps one of the most important things one can do: shift perspective, seeing experience as something arising within a space, and suddenly you've inserted an additional "meta" level that gives you a much greater amount of freedom.

> because there cannot be anyone who is real except for me

"Real" - that word again! "You" are not "real" either, though. By which I mean, that the pattern of sensations that constitute the experience of *being-this-person* is no different in kind to the pattern of sensations that constitute the experience of "that person over there".

>an experience that has no basis in permanency and exists only as a thought

No experience has a "basis in permanency" in that sense. The difference between an experience *of* something and thinking *about* something, is in the intensity and "1st-person-ness" of the experience, rather than a difference of kind.

> but who experiences it? me, right?

No-*one* experiences it; rather awareness *takes on the shape of* the experience. It doesn't "have" an experience and doesn't actually "experience" the experience - it *becomes* the experience.

> only i am real in that only my body is the only substantive body in existence

Your body isn't substantive at all. Close your eyes right now, and explore your body space and the space around it. Can you sense any boundary? What, *exactly*, is the experience of your body? Is it not, in fact, just a bunch of disconnected sensations, floating in open space, plus the related *thought about* a "body" as a substantive thing?

This is what I mean by both you and them being sensations in awareness. Them: visual, auditory, texture. You: visual, auditory, texture. The only difference is the apparent perspective of the arrangement of those sensations in the space of the moment.

Your body, though, isn't the cause of anything, it is simply part of a larger pattern - the world. In fact, calling it "your" body is misleading. There's nothing special about it. You might think of yourself as awareness having taken on the shape of *being-a-world-from-the-perspective-of-a-person*, but the actual body whose perspective is currently unfolded, isn't "prime" in any way really.

Intention (the 'first cause' reshaping of awareness) remains the only cause.

> then why am i located in this body?

You're not!

[Q: but i have no experiences not incorporating this body

because all intentions are revolving around this body

even if it changes - it is still *my* body that *i* have experiences by]

Of course you do: you dream and you think and even you watch movies, and so on. A vast amount of the time, your experience contains no bodily aspect at all - you just *think* it does, when you later think about it.

Meanwhile, intentions don't revolve around anything, they apply totally, shifting the overall state, I would say. You might intend with the body as part of the intention, but intention *itself* has no bodily aspect. So, is it not true that what you call "your body" is simply a collection of fleeting sensations coming and going within awareness, and your "true body" would be better described as *awareness itself*? Awareness is the only thing that is always there; "I am" is the only aspect of experience that never changes.

Awareness doesn't have a location - it is that which takes on the shape of experiences. Everything you are experience right now *is* it, and it *is* what you are. The body is an *object* of experience, awareness is the *subject* of experience.

You don't need a *body* to experience, however experience requires a *context* for its *content*. Awareness is that context, and all experiential content arises within (and *as*) that context.

You can think about this forever, but it's really something that is directly realise. For example as in the comment above, say, where you close your eyes and try to:

- a) find the "edges" of your current experience,
- b) find where "you" are in your current experience.

and:

- c) investigate what your current is experience is "made from".

Those observations are *the facts*. Everything else must adhere to those facts.

> the edge of my current experience is where i am limited to what i am able to do

The *spatial* edge, is what I'm urging you to seek.

> nowhere

And yet... everywhere. ***It's all you.***

> made from intentions

That's a *model* of experience. You do not ever actually experience an intention *as such*. What I mean is, when you attend to a sound or a texture or an image, what is it "made from"?

To clarify this: If you close your eyes right now and, say, touch a desk or a chair, what is that experience - that "touch" - made from?

And then: think of a red car. What is that thought made from?

> sensations

And stay with that sensation: what is the sensation made from? (Remembering the purpose here is not to *think about* it, but to actually attend to the experience itself.)

Then, bring the thought of the red car back: actually "feel into" the thought, try and pin down its location exactly and attend to it - again you are trying to attend to the experience of the thought itself, trying to see what it is "made from".

No *substance*, right. So, what are your conclusions from this little investigation, so far?

The adjustment I would make to that is that I wouldn't call them *pseudo*-experiences; they are just experiences. But chiefly: You are not a body, you don't ever really experience a body as conceived of, and that in fact *you are not an object at all*. You are, as you just said, "nothing". Nothing, that is, in the sense of not being of "substance". However you *do* have a property - that of *being-aware* - and you have the inherent ability to become any experience, with all experiences being "made from" you. That sound about right?

For the moment, let's put aside the fact that if you have a lucid dream, you *can* become any experience.

Okay, let's maybe roll back a bit and say: that *in principle*, since you have no inherent structure, there is no in-built limitation on the experiences you *might* have.

> yet there is no proof that that is *possible*

What proof could there be? **There is no proof of anything at all**, other than what we've just covered in our conversation here: that what you are, is *awareness* and awareness is the *context* of experience. That is the only thing that's always true. Beyond, that, there's the *content* of experience, and each experience is the proof of the experiencing of that experience *at that moment* - and nothing more, really.

However, we do know that we can seemingly have pretty much any experience (lucid dreaming), and that those experiences are no different in type to our "this world" experiences; they are at the same "level".

But I'm guessing that what you are referring to is the idea of having experiences which are apparently happening in "this world", right? Like, without an intermediate experience of "going to sleep" and *then* having the experience? An apparent discontinuity is what you are after?

Would that have to be the case, though? Or would you be content to fall asleep and then a dream starts and you never have the experience of waking up from it? In other words, to have a dramatic change at a *deep structural level* might require that you "let go" of your state so that it can shift, and that experience might actually be very close to "going to sleep".

> that would be the same as shifting into a 'new' reality

Well, "a reality" is just a concept, something we use to constructive a narrative about experience, typically after the fact (or to formulate an intention, perhaps). There is no difference, *in kind*, between having the experience of "blinking" and the world changing, and having the experience of "going to sleep" and it changing.

So what we are left with, then, is that there is no inherent fixed structure to *you-as-awareness*, and that the only proof of an experience is in the having of that experience. It's like being a shape-shifter who can only confirm they have the ability to adopt a particular shape, by adopting that shape; they cannot know in advance, because knowing would itself be a sort of experiencing of it.

Having a lucid dream would really help this exploration. Why don't you try and have one tonight?

In a lucid dream - which you might think of as a strand of experience seeded from a single image - you can (depending) generate pretty much anything. If dreams are the same as reality, then the lessons learned through experimentation in a lucid dream (which are much more responsive than the decades-worth of accumulated intentional patterning that this world is structured by, and therefore easier to do research in), would equally apply here...

If they are the same in nature, then the difference would be one of *patterning* rather than something fundamental (there is no such thing as a solid underlying substrate). From the investigations you performed in the exchange above, there is no reason to think that the same lessons do not apply. That is, lessons in *intention and patterning generally*; we're not talking about specific patterns here. All that is, is awareness, and intention is the only cause.

"Awareness" is the name for what you discovered everything was, when you went looking into your experience earlier in our conversation - and is what you are actually are. It is the cause of everything in a sense, but not in the sense of their being a cause and effect. Rather, metaphorically speaking, it has everything "dissolved" with in it as potential, and it "becomes" those things. The "manifested universe" and the "infinite grid" are metaphors, but also patterns which can be used to shape - used *as shapes of* - experience. So it wouldn't be quite right to say that awareness "causes" them, so much as they are patterns that awareness can adopt.

As I mentioned earlier, we have to be careful that we are not imagining the world is "made from awareness" in the same way that we might say it is "made from atoms". It is more like a space which takes on the shape of sensory moments - like this one right now, with you apparently "over here" and the screen "over there" - with all possible experiences available to it. You might say that the world is not a *place* with you in it - instead, the world is a *dimensionless pattern* which can be examined by unfolding it as moments. (Although of course, that is itself a metaphor.)

> ok, but what caused that potential to be?

It's eternal. Awareness is "before" time and space; time and space are aspects of experience, as patterning; they are not fundamental. Everything already exists, because there is no time within which things can come into, and fall out of, existence.

> so awareness exists before awareness?

See above. Awareness's only inherent property is *being-aware*. Everything else, including "change" and "spatial extent" are patterns which awareness might take on - relatively speaking, that is, because all patterns are present always (so you might say its other pseudo-property is "potential", I suppose, but it's better to keep it simple).

> isn't that metaphor itself a pattern - so what caused the concept of metaphors, awareness and all potentialities to exist?

All our descriptions are metaphors, and all metaphors can be adopted at experiential patterning. If you can think of something, it exists, and the only difference between a thought *of* something and an experience *of* it, is the position (3rd person or 1st person) and relative intensity.

As to the existence of those patterns, then as I said, they are not "caused" in the sense of ever having been "created"; they are eternal. (Note: it is easy to get into a tangle in language here, because words like "exist" and "created" have certain associations which imply a temporal or spatial aspect, which does not in fact apply to the sorts of "existence" and "creation" we are often talking about here.)

> that being the case - i must be the only awareness in existence

However, you are not **an** awareness, remember. Awareness is "before" division and multiplicity, which are merely patterns that awareness can take on. So you are not *an* awareness, nor are you *the* awareness - you are *awareness*. There is neither many *nor* one of them; it is not an object. It is *meaningless* to talk awareness in any way that implies it has edges, either in time or space, or any relation within those contexts, because those contexts exist *within* awareness. Basically: awareness doesn't exist, it is that which takes on the shape of existence, or contains all of existence. (There's no accurate way to put it in language, because language can only handle conceptual objects, which means we are "already wrong" when talking about this.)

So the answer to that is both yes and no, *sort of*, but "yes" is a reasonable approximation for everyday use. However, we must note that, given the above, this is not the same as being the only *person*. Awareness is not personal.

So, awareness doesn't exist in the usual sense, because it has no edges and no beginning or end, it doesn't not even "last forever" because it is "before time" and so such things are meaningless (tend to use the word "eternal" to mean this, as distinct from "forever" and so on). It is not an object, not a thing. There are not many awarenesses, *but neither is there one awareness*.

However, due to limitations of language and thought - which can only handle objects, because language and thought are "after" division and cannot capture anything "before" it - when we consider this topic we still, inevitably, tend to conceive of awareness as being a "thing", perhaps unwittingly. We must bear in mind that "the awareness can be thought of, is not the true awareness" (to paraphrase a well known saying). We can *be* it, and always *are* it, and we can directly *know* it, but we cannot think *about* it or *reason* it. All language can do is indicate what it is *not*, and then we via direct insight we recognise that it... *is*.

Tricky stuff. It's part of a larger issue that your thoughts while in a particular state are formatted in terms of that state. And that is where the problem of conflating "being awareness" and "being the only person" comes in. Really *no* state is the one true state; they are equal and, while they last, internally self-consistent and hence *relatively* true. So, you can have experiences "as if" you were the only person, or "as if" you are a person in a shared world with other people, or "as if" you are a space in which sensory moments arise, or "as if"... and so on. All of those patterns will be relatively true while in the corresponding state. But none of them are fundamentally true. You are not the only person *nor* are you one of many people, fundamentally.

The only thing that is always true, then, is the fact of awareness, which is not a thing, so much as a way of saying that *being-aware* is the only persistent aspect to experience.

I'd still disagree with the notion of a "prime body" - at best, the phrase seems potentially misleading?

To be clear, you/me are not the only "actually aware individual", because it is not the individual that is aware. Rather, you might say that *you-as-awareness* is aware *of and as* an (apparent) individual. Upon inspection, though, you don't really find that individual at all - just a few sensations, plus there's an idea of a "person", which is just a connective fiction that you've come up with at some point.

More accurately: neither "other" people *nor* "this" person are beings, ignorant or otherwise - they are *patterns of being*. Only awareness itself can be ignorant or not - that is, to comprehend its true nature, itself as context rather than as content.

It is not the individual, then, that is worthy of time or effort, because there's nothing inherently special about this one - you might shift perspective at any moment, or shift pattern more dramatically. That's why I tend to phrase it as:

- "What you truly are is awareness, currently taking on the shape of the experience of ***being-a-world***-*from-the-perspective-of-a-person*."

That way it is clear that intentions apply to the whole world-pattern, not to the apparent individual you are skulking around. "Experiences are apparently global; intentions are actively global", you might say. Just as with moire fringes, although it might *seem* that results are local, in fact every intentional pattern is applied across the entirety, is a shift of the whole world-pattern at once.

[...]

> My question is centered around how these "infinite" shapes of experiences might contribute to the formatting (patterning) of one another.

So, I would suggest that *they don't*, as such, but just as you say, it can be tricky to keep our terms in line, and I think what you are getting at towards the end of your post corresponds to how I'm thinking of it. But to be super-clear, let's pick out a couple of things below.

Note: because of the nature of the topic, it's sometimes difficult to pick out what is being assumed, so sometimes we might say things that seem obvious, and sometimes it may seem we miss an obvious point. In other words: just pick away at whatever doesn't make sense, and obviously my own description might actually be inconsistent anyway!

World, Context, Division

> Should I call this world level pattern a context, a stage?

I'd call it a *state*, because I feel that "context" or "stage" implies that something is happening *inside* of that pattern. I'd say that *awareness* is the *context* of all experience, which adopts a state corresponding to a particular relative distribution or intensity of all possible patterns, and that everything else is best considered as *content*. Between a intentional shifts, the state is completely *static*, and fully defines all the moments of experience. Even "time is passing" is a static pattern.

> I take Awareness dividing (achieving multiplicity) to mean it is taking on ALL the possible shapes of experience.

Okay, but to be clear: when I talk of (apparent) multiplicity, I *don't* mean that it is splitting up into separate perspectives which are all "happening" at the same time. I mean it in the sense of you apparently being "over here" while the screen is "over there", even though upon inspection you realise that "you" are actually everywhere and all of it. And: the only thing that is "happening" is your experience right now. "Time passing" is an aspect of the current experience, and does not exist outside of it. So there is nothing happening "at the same time" as this experience of the pattern *being-a-world-from-the-perspective-of-a-person*.

The State of George Washington

> There is a shape of an experience of a George Washington who founded the United States.

There is, implicitly, and there is every other type of experience too, just dissolved into the background, ready to be intended into relative prominence, such that it becomes the current state/experience.

> This is also a 1st-person perspective experience unfolding in time in "a world".

But it is not "unfolding in time" right now. And the 1st-person perspective isn't "in" a world. It is a state that you could switch to, and if you switched to it, then that experience would become what is "happening" now. At the moment, though, it is just an eternal pattern sat in the background.

> That shape of an experience is only one of ALL possible experiences but is still "just" Awareness.

Right. So let's summarise this model so far:

- There is "awareness"
- Dissolve within awareness are all possible patterns, and those are eternal.
- By selecting a particular combination of patterns, awareness becomes a "state".
- That "state" might be conceptualised as corresponding to a certain list of facts - a combination of a particular set of patterns, at different levels of contribution - which define a world and a perspective upon that world, and therefore defines a certain experience.
- One such state/experience might be *being-a-world-in-1790-from-the-perspective-of-George-Washington*.
- Another such state/experience might be *being-a-world-in-2016-from-the-perspective-of-djdu982*.
- If a state is not activated, then it is not "happening".
- The "happening" of an experience amounts to, you might say, "scanning one's attention" across the moments defined by that particular state, basically unfolding it moment-by-moment into the senses.

So there could be a "me" state that has a world aggregation pattern that involved a George Washington pattern contribution.

So, if what you mean there is that there exists a state (an aggregate pattern) which corresponds to the experience of being George Washington, then yes that would be correct. In order to (apparently) be George Washington, awareness would "take on the shape of" that state, instead of the current state. From this we see that *you-as-awareness* has no permanent "me"-ness about it, other than *being-aware* and being able to adopt any state/experience "as if" it were true.

"George Washington" doesn't contribute anything, though, because he is not a being and doesn't create anything. There there is no "shared" aspect to the different patterns as such - they don't contribute, they just *are* and *can be* - but all such patterns *are* available to adopt as a (logically self-consistent) experience.

Aside - There's a whole tangle we can get into about "other people" and "other perspectives. The convenient placeholder for that is to point out that the world is not a "shared spatially-extended place unfolding in time" and instead is more like a "shared toy box of potential patterns and experiences". The benefit to this isn't that it is fundamentally correct (because awareness is "before" all time and space notions anyway), but that it avoids making the usual errors of thinking - e.g. that things are happening at the same time in parallel, or one after the other in sequence, when both of those descriptions are actually *meaningless* rather than wrong.

The "Moments" Metaphor

> My assumption I guess is that all of these states are active.

To give ourselves a simpler way to conceive of this, we could temporarily move away from the abstraction of "patterns" and take a subset of the idea. Let's consider it as all possible "moments" being present, now - a "moment" being a 3D multi-sensory 1st-person frame of experience - but at different levels of intensity. So, right now, both the moment of "I am sat here looking at this screen" and the moment of "I am in the kitchen holding a mug of coffee" are present, however the former is turned up to full brightness and the latter is dim. Similarly, "I am George Washington chopping down a cherry tree" is also present, but dim.

> Would not all possible pattern combinations have actually been experienced by awareness, meaning activated and happens?

The problem here, is that you are still referring to things based on some sort of external reference time, which doesn't exist. Awareness doesn't have a record of history beyond its current state, as the eternal Now, and all so-called memories of apparent recollections of "past" experiences are themselves actually "moments", now (experiences of "remembering the past").

Imagine a landscape with a particular set of contours. I am a gardener who has no memory capacity. I modify the landscape. Where is the old set of contours? Perhaps I call hills in one region of the landscape "the past" and other hills in another region "now" - but actually the entire landscape is Now, and if it changes without leaving a trace in the region I've labelled "the past", then there is no record of it. *Note: Even this description is incorrect, because its construction is based on a notion of an 'outside' time perspective.*

Eternity vs Forever

> Same question different wording: Would not all possible pattern combinations have actually been experienced by awareness, meaning activated and happens?

We might be tempted to say that, given eternity, all possible experiences must have been experienced. However, this confuses "eternity" with "forever". The latter has an implied time components; eternity has no time component, it is outside of, or "before" time.

> Maybe this is where "dissolved" comes into play?

Right. So, referring now to the top of this comment, we have a better way to conceive of things.

Rather than talking of the experience of all possible combinations occurring sequentially or in parallel, in time, we instead take on the notion that all possible "moments" (and patterns) are *always* being experienced, Now. At this moment, which is actually the only moment, you are experience everything, just with a different relative distribution of intensities or "brightnesses". All "moments" are Now, as This Moment, and it is eternal. *Every* "moment" is the experience of everything.

> [Dissolved] I do not fully get this meaning.

The use of the "dissolved" metaphor in general is meant to be an accessible way of conveying that you can be experiencing something, now even though it has not been "unpacked" or "unfolded" into sensory objects. In fact, if you pay attention to your direct experience more, you'll discover that there is this *felt-knowing* which is like the "global summary" sense of your state, and it is that which is your "knowing" of your current moment, more than the visual and auditory aspects of the experience.

Dissolving & Divisions

> Are the "dissolved" patterns like the many many colors on a painter's palette? can be combined in any combination or intensity. All of these colors are available to be experienced in any final "state", but does not become "active", or a state, or experienced, until the colors end up on the canvas?

That's a good metaphor - *except* that we want to avoid there being an implication of division or process. By this, I mean we don't want to depict the colours being "over there" and then we select them and paint a result "over here".

You'll notice that with metaphors such as the "imagination room", they are at pains to try to remove the separation between the "components", the "scene" and the "experiencer". Hence all that stuff about being "an awareness which 'takes on the shape of' experiences"; the shape-shifter as metaphor removes all sense of separation. However, we always end up having to introduce something of that sort because we need to convey that there is a potential within the shape-shifter, even though it is not his present shape.

Another approach to this is David Bohm's idea of the implicate and explicate orders, as described in his book *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*. He uses the physical example of a column of glycerine. From that Wikipedia entry:

> **[Ink droplet analogy**
>
> Bohm also used the term unfoldment to characterise processes in which the explicate order becomes relevant (or "relevated"). Bohm likens unfoldment also to the decoding of a television signal to produce a sensible image on a screen. The signal, screen, and television electronics in this analogy represent the implicate order whilst the image produced represents the explicate order.
>
> He also uses an example in which an ink droplet can be introduced into a highly viscous substance (such as glycerine), and the substance rotated very slowly such that there is negligible diffusion of the substance. In this example, the droplet becomes a thread which, in turn, eventually becomes invisible. However, by rotating the substance in the reverse direction, the droplet can essentially reform. When it is invisible, according to Bohm, the order of the ink droplet as a pattern can be said to be implicate within the substance.

> In another analogy, Bohm asks us to consider a pattern produced by making small cuts in a folded piece of paper and then, literally, unfolding it. Widely separated elements of the pattern are, in actuality, produced by the same original cut in the folded piece of paper. Here the cuts in the folded paper represent the implicate order and the unfolded pattern represents the explicate order.]

No analogy is perfect for this - it is inherently impossible to have a metaphor which is complete here, because as soon as we make a division we are "wrong", which basically means as soon as we *think about it* we are "wrong". So the best approach is to consider lots of different metaphors which are "wrong" is slightly different, non-overlapping ways, and we eventually build up a direct intuition for the situation - like that *felt-sense* I was talking about - which does not need to be unpacked into mental objects; it is "immediate".

> So same question a 3rd way, has awareness painted all the possible paintings?

Hopefully the exploration above has covered that in a way that makes sense: all possible paintings are here, now; it is not meaningful to talk of paintings in history, because awareness is "before" time.

> Can there only be one shape or state that awareness has active?

Yes, but that state is infinitely complex of course - **and yet totally simple:** because it has no inherent division. Which leads us to...

The Simplicity of Experience

Once again, it is important to emphasise that what we are discussing above is a description, a metaphor, a "parallel construction in thought". It is not "how things really are" or "how things really work", because there *is* no "how things really are" or "how things really work".

Actually, the only thing that is fundamentally true is *being-aware*. Everything else is *relatively* true only - that is, we can have experiences "as if" they are true, by intending the formatting of experience or intending outcomes which imply a particular formatting of experience.

So, what we are trying to do in the above is produce a description which is the more flexible coherent model which *makes sense* - which can be used to describe any experience as a sort of general narrative, and which can be used to formulate intentions without implying a restrictive world-view. This is only one side of our explorations into "the nature of experiencing"; the other, primary one, is to attend to experience as it actually is, and therefore *directly realise* our situation, rather than just *think about it*.

From a previous comment:

Experience-Of vs Thinking-About

Awareness doesn't have a location - it is that which takes on the shape of experiences. Everything you are experience right now *is* it, and it *is* what you are. The body is an *object* of experience, awareness is the *subject* of experience. You don't need a *body* to experience, however experience requires a *context* for its *content*. Awareness is that context, and all experiential content arises within (and *as*) that context.

You can think about this forever, but it's really something that is directly realise.

For example as in the comment above, say, where you close your eyes and try to:

- a) find the "edges" of your current experience,
- b) find where "you" are in your current experience.

and:

- c) investigate what your current is experience is "made from".

Those observations are *the facts*. Everything else must adhere to those facts.

The *only* thing that is "real" (unchanging) is "awareness" - otherwise known as *being-aware*, since it has no inherent structure beyond that property. *Everything* else is temporary, which is to say *relatively* real/true only.

You still seem to be reaching for a "realness" which is "behind" experience, but there is no such thing. *That* is the meaning of phrases such as "what is seen is seen". It's trying to convey that what is seen is what is seen - *and there's no more to it than that*.

Narratives and the like are just a way to formulate descriptions of what has been observed so far, of what is currently observed as part of the present state, and to formulate intentions. Beyond that, though, there's nothing "insightful" about them at a fundamental level. Fundamentally, there's just *being-aware* and whatever is currently *being-aware-of*. If you want to experience something, the only way is to think about it, intend it, in the 1st person, "as if" it were happening, until it becomes intense and stable, so that the "as if" persists. You don't do this - rather you become it, until it is fixed as (relatively) true. This is, in fact, your current situation, in aftermath.

Pause this moment. Now, think of a red car. Really, this is better phrased is "think a red car into existence within your perception, albeit a low-intensity one" - or "think a red car" for short. So, now you have a red car.

Did "you" think of a "red car"? Where, *exactly*, in your experience, is this "you" that did the thinking? It is nowhere/everywhere. It turns out that "you" do not think the red car, in the sense of being a separate thinker. Rather, the red car is *within you*, you as a *subject* or *context* (and not an object).

If you were to keep "thinking a red car" it would become more stable and persistent as an image. Now, instead of "thinking a red car", you do "thinking being inside a red car". That is, you are not just seeing a red car from some outside vantage point, rather you are experiencing a full multi-sensory 1st-person frame of being in a red car. Consider what it would be like to hold that "being inside a red car" thought until it became stable, persistent, intense, brighter than your apparent present surroundings!

That is what is meant by intention until it is fixed. No persuasion, no pretending in the sense of a separate subject and object. It is a *becoming-asserting* or "thinking the experience something-being-true". (Language forces upon us a subject/object division here; we are forced to get creative in order to indicate that's not what is meant.)

Do some things - how? You "shift" yourself, there is no "doing", which means one "part" operating on another "part". And even then, language makes it sound like some sort of action, when it is not really. There's a risk, here, that you are being distracted into wrestling with conceptual shadows, both modern and old, which are intended to *point* to things, rather than be things you spend time manipulating.

> i do things like go to the car rental place and rent a red car

Not necessarily. Yes, if you just set it as a fact. But if you truly stayed with the image until it replaced the current one, you would actually *be in that situation*. Of course, this might take a while, but that would be up to you, whether you'd persist with the experiment or not.

> right but i can't do something that doesn't exist

Everything exists already. If you can think it, it exists. There is no other sort of existence. If you can think *about* or *of* something (from a 3rd-person perspective, like imagining a car over there, as a normal thought), then you can *think it* (from a 1st-person perspective, as we were just discussing). There is nothing more to it.

Again: to think of something *is* to experience it - in the 3rd person. All that remains is to think of it in the 1st person, and then you are "living it" rather than "thinking about it". It is identical in nature: intensifying imagery within awareness. (This applies to more abstract facts and patterns too; it's not just restricted to having an expanded audio-visual-texture thought, although it gets harder to describe beyond that.)

> ok well i just want to focus on meeting radha

As in, because it would be a cool experience? Fair enough! :-)

Reply to “Misunderstandings”

> > /u/TriumphantGeorge states that "dimension jumping" is actually just a metaphor. It's all been a metaphor. I don't mean to shoot anyone down with this. If you believe you are actually jumping between dimensions and shifting the OBJECTIVE REALITY, go for it, I'm not going to stop you

However, to say it is "just" a metaphor is also misleading. That implies that metaphors are lessers things, that they are not "real" like other things which are "objective". The sense in which "dimensional jumping" is *just* a metaphor is the same sense in which "objective reality" is *just* a metaphor.

To highlight:

> >It's a place to change your subjective perception of reality, meanwhile the objective one remains unchanged.

I have never encountered an "objective perception" of reality. In fact, strictly speaking, I'm not sure I can say that I have ever experienced a "reality" at all. The context of the statement would be all important.

It is also worth considering whether there is truly a difference between having an experience that "really" happened and having one "as if" something happened. The *experience* certainly happened; the *explanation* of that experience is another thing. The explanation is in fact itself another experience: "the experience of thinking about an experience". Explanations are never "what really happened", you might say. Unless perhaps one thinks that the world is actually made from explanations! (Although: there is a sense in which that might be viewed as an accurate statement, but not by the straightforward interpretation of it.)

Anyway, you get the idea. The sidebar text and the introduction already give the perspective to take (and there's no risk of posts or my comments being deleted; the idea behind the subreddit is that a lot of the content will be in the evolving discussion taking place within the comments). From there, the intention is that people do some exercises, contemplate the results and their ongoing experience more generally.

There is, in fact, probably not much point trying to work out what this "really is" without engaging with that. It can lead to one simply creating more "castles in the sky" (self-consistent conceptual frameworks which "make sense" within themselves, but do not actually connect do the the topic of direct experience - that is, they are "conceptually true" only). Regardless, one needs to be really picky when it comes to how we use our familiar concepts and ideas here; because perhaps familiarity is the only thing making them seem valid.

[1] It's obviously worth asking what "dimensional jumping" and "objective reality" are metaphors *of* or *for*. One answer: they are metaphors for the patterning of our experience; they are possible "as if" perspectives on them. Of course, "patterning" is *itself* a metaphor! However, it perhaps benefits from having less in the way of hidden assumptions between the direct experience and the description - plus it self-declares as a metaphor rather than claiming to be "what is really happening".

[...]

> I just wanted to highlight that for newer people to this sub, so they can decide for themselves if they believe it or not.

Indeed. But it's hopefully not a matter of people "believing" something (or not) based on what they read. As the sidebar tries to underline - and it really does give you all you need to get started - it's about conducting a personal investigation and then drawing your own conclusions. In fact, "belief" is probably too strong a word: people don't *believe* in an "objective world", they just never really examined the idea one way or another, nor paid much attention to the structure of their own perception.

I'm not even sure that most people truly understand what is actually meant by a phrase like "objective reality", beyond the vague background assumption that what they supposedly are is a *person-object* located within some sort of *place-environment*. Most people, I would suggest, have never truly examined - intellectually or practically - their assumptions about their ongoing experience in any way. And then, if prompted to, they mostly go straight into *thinking-about* it at a surface level, rather than attending to it. *Most don't even know what attending-to even is.* This tends to result in wandering around the same ideas in a circle.

> solipsism is by definition unfalsifiable

That's not necessarily the case, I'd suggest. It is true that there can be no *content-based* falsification of solipsism. But, it might be possible to notice something about your ongoing experience, its *context*, which suggests that ideas like solipsism are *meaningless* - that they do not apply. They are "not even wrong" as a description of one's situation. Similarly, the idea of an "objective world". That is not to say that they are not *useful* ideas, though. Recognising that these ideas (those, and "atoms", "particles", "waves", and so on) constitute "effective theories" rather than explanations in the sense of behind-the-scenes truth, is probably quite important. (People often pay lipservice to this, but not much more than that, especially over the last few decades where increasingly descriptions are taken as literally true, actual "things".) This is one of the senses in which the "objective world" and "dimensional jumping" are both metaphors.

To emphasise, though: this subreddit is not about *believing* anything. However, it might be about *examining* - everything.

> And "belief" isn't that strong of a word to describe the situation.

I think I'm just keen to have a more specific use of the word "belief" when discussing this particular topic. Certainly, as you say, the everyday use covers all those situations you allude to. But here, when dealing with a deliberate examination of the nature of experience, it's useful to highlight when something is more of an unexamined "assumption" than an explicit "belief". It can seem nitpicky, but making distinctions like that can help when digging deeper, I feel.

> When all is said and done, this boils down to solipsism vs. realism

I personally don't think that's the case, and for a reason: you can observe something about your direct experience which simultaneously *re-contextualises* "realism" and makes *untenable* the common version of "solipsism". Loosely speaking, we end up with: in the former case, there is no place for a "real world" to be; in the latter case, there is no place for a countable "object" to be and hence nothing for experience to "belong" to.

Now, if one has no new information - no additional experiences to add to one's memories-to-date; no fresh container concept either - then certainly it seems that we are left with an intellectual choice between "realism"

or "solipsism". This is why there is an encouragement to conduct certain experiments, and why the sidebar calls them "exercises" rather than, say, "methods". (And to really ponder what a "description" actually is.)

> As a side note I'd like to applaud you for keeping this discussion civil and well-meaning

Likewise. Hopefully the subreddit is *all about* encouraging collaborative discussion, an ongoing conversation - albeit one guided by a certain approach. That "certain approach" though, is based on engaging with ideas and beliefs *as ideas*, rather than fighting to "win" exchanges. After all, who knows where the next interesting or useful angle may come from? Certainly, it's unlikely that it will arise from people just viewing everything in exactly the same way and nodding their heads in precise agreement! (Or fighting in such a way as nothing is gained by anyone.)

> The exercises themselves, however, are biased in favor of confirming one side over the other.

I don't think so? There is no content within the exercises themselves. And they are definitely not *intended* to involve a selection between two viewpoints, as such. Instead, quite possibly the conclusion would be that *both* viewpoints belong to a certain "type", and that the "type" is *itself* something to be questioned.

> They can be explained through other means that don't require this.

The issue, here, is that the exact nature of "explanations" is one of the things under examination.

> But I do think that some more clarification was needed for people to decide if this really is the subreddit and ideology for them

Ultimately, although it doesn't explicitly state this, it's sort of about being *anti*-ideology. (Although not just for the sake of it, of course.) It not "selling" a viewpoint. Rather, it's pushing a critical view of *all* descriptions of experience, as a category, with an encouragement to do a couple of little exercises which highlight this, directly (because there's no point in just thinking about this within any particular conceptual framework; you just go round in circles). In other words, the clarification comes from the participation, via personal investigation. There's not really any other way to do so that sticks; it's just more thoughts otherwise. The final context of it is non-conceptual (it can't be resolved into mental objects related within a representation space), which obviously poses a problem.

None of this is particularly new, though, of course. The idea of "believing in" concepts and reifying them versus direct experience is a relatively new thing, I'd say - and has been retro-fitted onto past figures who explicitly criticised such an approach. For example, the key physicists of the early 20th century, and so on. As philosophy's prominence in physics diminished, and science became more like piecewise engineering built on prior conceptual platforms, we're left in quite an odd moment when it comes to the idea of "the real". Which is an interesting thing to explore, I think - hence all this.

Since the subreddit is ultimately non-ideological, the main battle is to prevent *any* particular "understanding" from becoming dominant to the exclusion of others. That would be what would constitute a "poisoning of the well". You're right that the internet is tricky when it comes to this.

Now, it is true that not all newcomers to the discussion arrive at the same "level" - but that is fine, I think. With a topic such as this, intellectual elitism is quickly exposed, whilst ignorance is revealed as opportunity. From experience, though, you can't really just tell people "this is how it is". You really have to engage with them on their own terms.

Fortunately, as one of the moderators, I have some influence over that! Plus we take the approach of "moderation via contribution", which hopefully ensures anything that gains momentum does not continue for long without coming under appropriate scrutiny. As a subreddit somewhat built on being *against* taking things on faith, though, we are generally in a good position here - even if Tom Cruise *does* show up and jumps on the subreddit sofa...

(Probably the real enemy for us is the casual comment declaring that "I read somewhere that this or that is the answer to your question", followed by nonsense! Corrective responses are time-consuming.)

Anyway, it is good when people (such as yourself) from all different perspectives are willing to engage, since it's not really about being "right" so much as digging into the construction and implications of this or that view (and its relationship to experience).

[...]

Just to interject: this flavour of the realist's position (naive realism) does make some assumptions about the nature of that "real external world". That is, it assumes that "the world" is of the same format as our sensory experience and is, broadly speaking: a "stable, simply-shared, spatially-extended 'place' unfolding in 'time'".

However, one *can* develop a position which still retains independent observers, but which views the world more as an "infinite gloop" or "eternal toy box" of patterns, from which a subset is selected into experience. This is of course not dissimilar to the "you are that which 'takes on the shape of' experience" description, but retains the (unobserved) boundary of the "real external world" concept. It still has the same problem: the idea of some "no, really!" world that is above and beyond and how things "actually" are, even if it is never observed and direct experience is contrary to it. But it at least alters the supposed nature of that world so that we're dealing with something like a difference of *perspective* rather than a difference of *fact*.

Obviously, this position still falls down in terms of something we might "believe" is "really true" when we start looking at the nature and location of the *description itself*. But it does have *utility* when accounting for certain experiences for which the naive version doesn't - and ultimately it is an "effective theory" that we're really about, rather than a "true" one. Remembering that this isn't just thinking in a void: we're perhaps responding to certain experiments and results, here. (It might be thinking *as* a void, though!)

Reply to “So ive been thinking about the implications of the physical world being a malleable illusion..”

This is a very good topic. Okay, let me suggest that this arises from having *thoughts-about* this but not the *direct-experience.* Some points to ponder. Perhaps:

- You are still speaking from being a person in the world, while in fact the full experience this leads to is of being "one" with everything. Rather than separation and loneliness, it's a complete merging. You are not "just a consciousness", you are everything. *But you can't think about this, you can only experience it.*
- So you are not a person in fact, but while you are having a very localised experience, you will indeed *feel* separated. As a result your idea of "purpose" - although it may arise in many forms - will actually boil down to seeking "connection" with the rest of the world.

  Any desires you have to get with people, to take control of your life, to get that promotion, to dominate it - they are all different ways to try and include more of the world into yourself, even as they *appear* to be about something else.
- The stage you're at right now is that you've recognised the emptiness of those aims (that they won't fulfil you) but you've not yet settled into the larger perspective. It *seems* like you've got the isolation, you've destroyed what you thought was the solution, and you haven't found the alternative. But that will improve.

So it's worth asking: why did things seem to matter before? Did the idea of various arrangements of dead atoms doing things to other arrangements of dead atoms - until eventually the arrangements fall apart - seem more meaningful? Was it more "real"?

The *only* thing that is real is "being conscious" - and there's no "just" in that. Consciousness "taking on the shape of experiences" was the only meaningful thing there ever was, in terms of direct and full living. It's been true all along, and if you look back at the times you were genuinely happy you will realise this. There's a difference between a brief cessation of "wanting" after getting something, and a wider happiness that comes from a more expanded view.

Realising that, you will have saved yourself the pain of pursuing religion, beliefs, objects, property, people in the expectation that they will fulfil your need - and instead you can enjoy them for what they are.

The alternative is that 50 years from now (or whatever) you end up going: "hey, I've ticked all the boxes for 'stuff I want' and yet I still feel the same". Only *then* understanding that those checkpoints were only enjoyable distractions, and the feeling you've been after all along is independent of particular events and things. It's a shift in perspective and identification.

Content is for fun, consciousness is for real? *EDIT: That sounds like "a dog's not just for Christmas".*

[...]

So, the next step (in my reasoning) would be to just directly *become* the background space of experience - and knowing that all facts are dissolved within that, assert them into prominence. In essence, this is replacing the anchor of breathe with the unchanging and always-persent "boundless container" in which experiences arise.

Since that is always available, you can assert that as your perspective permanently and without revision (because it never shifts). It gives you the blend of: rock solid presence, non-attachment to content which allows shifting, but also complete awareness of experience.

This is what examples like *The Imagination Room* and *A Line Of Thought* are trying to point towards.

[...]

Person-Formatting

> The idea of time and space must exist, otherwise we could not be experiencing this idea.

Yes, definitely true. Anything that is experienced does exist - *in the form it is experienced*.

> I'm saying it's also possible that: although consciousness itself is unrestricted; the points of view (person-illusions) are restricted; restricted by the consciousness itself.

I'd like to rephrase this. I'd like to say that points of view are experiences, and if they are apparently restricted then that is the experience of restriction (really the experience of structure or "formatting"). I wouldn't say something can be restricted "by" consciousness, because inherently it has no structure other than the structure it adopts. So -

> it's possible for your experience as this person-illusion to be restricted by other rules.

Or we could say that the experience of *being-a-person-in-a-world* actually **is** the experience of consciousness being structured in a particular way - of having "taken on a particular shape".

Let's not call it "rules" perhaps, because that suggests an external enforcer or an unbendable structure. It's more like:

- If a piece of paper wants to experience being a cylinder, it must fold itself in a certain way. Now, it is of course free to take on another shape at any time - however, *for as long as it wants to experience the world as being a cylinder, it cannot undo that particular fold*.
- If it *does* temporary become non-cylinder, and then readopts the cylinder shape - it is unlikely to be able to access memories from that other form. They would make no sense.

This leads us to:

- Currently you are having a "human-formatted" experience consisting of: spatial extent in which arises vision, sound, taste, smell, texture, presence, global-summary *felt-sense*.
- On top of that you have accumulated observations = "your world".
- There is no reason why you can't modify any of that, however you will cease to have continuity of *being-a-person-in-a-world*. (In this subreddit, we aim to retain the human formatting, while breaking the continuity of the world-pattern.)

So as you say.

Multitasking/Processing

> I might imagine it like a computer processor multitasking; except that all events "occur" outside of time.

So, you had to imagine it spatially and as a process "happening" in some sense. But it *can't* be like that. *EDIT: Which isn't to say it's not useful as a description, but it's not one we should ever commit to as a real restriction.*

We are entering into the realm of the unthinkable, really, where we have to recognise that all metaphors are incorrect because that is limited by our "human-formatting". We are trying to imagine something outside of experience, and therefore outside of space and time (which are aspects of experience) - and therefore *something which doesn't exist*. Unless we can grasp it directly...

Indescribable Existence

> *[Directing your attention to where you are looking out from:]* The best way I can describe it is "something that's not nothing".

Indeed! And I suggest:

If you attend to it, you'll find that it stretches on forever in that direction. And then you'll notice that it this is true in every direction. And whatever you are experiencing is floating "inside" that sort of spaceless space - as thoughts, sensations, perceptions. And those experience are "made from" that something. And if you go looking for "you", you will find that you *are* that thingless thing. You might conclude:

- *That is consciousness, and that is what you are, "taking on the shape of" this experience.*

And as you attend to it, you realise that it is featureless and unbounded - you will not be able to conceive of there being *two* of this, because it has no inherent properties.

- *This is the direct truth of the situation.*

So we might realise that it literally makes no logical sense to talk of more than one consciousness, or even multiple perspectives, because you cannot use time and space in the description. As I said in a previous comment we can think of the world as a "shared resource", but even that is just a way of dodging the main pitfalls, it is not "true" either - although it does fit our observations more closely.

It *is* the only awareness, your direct experience should tell you this. There is no "outside" to it. However that is different from saying the content of experience being the only experience, the only content.

Again, if you examine how you are conceiving of these things, you'll realise you are doing so in terms of parts and their locations in mental space relative to one another. *Such things exist only as experiences.* You are basically imagining "people" in another form, surely, as if they were "bodies" in a "space"?

I'd say - Consciousness (the "non-material material whose only property is being-aware") cannot divide itself, just as water cannot divide itself. However, it can take on the form of ripples and waves. So -

The way in which consciousness is limitless is that, having no defined density or granularity, it can adopt infinitely detailed structure *within* itself. Which is why I say it is better to throw away the metaphors of space and within and interaction, and instead discuss it interns of all possible content being dissolved *in* it - and therefore it is all being experienced "eternally".

Of course, the problem here is that we're talking in metaphors about the very thing that all metaphors are made from. It's not even like trying to use waves to describe water, it's like trying to use waves to describe "blue". So, "blue" is everywhere in water and waves, but it is not located anywhere and it is not made from anything. How many "blue"s are there in water? Is "blue" ever divided?

It's just not describable.

However:

Perhaps it helps if we go back to what we're actually trying to explain here. And that is:

- The world does not behave as a co-created place.

It doesn't take much experimentation to prove to yourself that it behaves like a pattern within you, which you have unbounded influence over, including "other people", and including "historical facts".

It is "as if" everyone has their own private copy of the world. That they are a "something" (that thing you directly experienced earlier) that has taken on the shape of *being-a-world* viewed from a particular perspective - and all intentions apply globally, even if outcomes are only observed locally.

> My direct experience tells me the opposite. I've experienced communication...

To be clear: by direct experience I don't mean the content. I mean the direct experience of the background *right now*, in which all content appears.

Let me just emphasise that what I mean by "consciousness" is not your apparent perspective or the structure it takes on, it is "awareness itself". It is all you ever experience, really, just in different forms.

So, as to the other stuff, I completely understand what you are saying, but there is a problem which we can't get away from:

- You never experience an outside to awareness, because it has no inside or outside.
- Imagining things outside of your experience, using your experience, is literally meaningless (because you can never experience that). It is simply fantasising.

However:

- Conceiving of things tends to format the content of experience "as if" they were true. You are literally patterning your experience by adopting and thinking of certain ideas. *Fantasising actively alters experience.*

In other words, we can imagine all sorts of dimensions and multiverses and all that - and you might have corresponding experiences, but they will only appear in the form of thoughts, sensations and perceptions. If you can imagine it, then it's a potential experience! The way in which it exists is as a thought, not as an external thing that has an independent existence, but fortunately, all experiences are just thoughts anyway - they just happen to be immersive.

This is the basis of "dimensional jumping". This is hard to make clear. But, say, you are having a lucid dream. In what sense does the content of that dream exist? You can have experiences "as if" there are other people, "as if" they are puppets, "as if" you are jumping dimensions. But all the time, you will simply be having sensations arising in awareness. *The world has no depth.*

> If reality is not being co-created, why the delay between your wishing something, and getting it? I have a hypothesis.

I say - Accumulated structure. If you simply "wish" things then it will tend to appear when an appropriate context arises, in terms of defining observations (=active patterns) thus far. To "wish" is to increase the contribution of a particular pattern. It "shines through" when an appropriate space allows/associates it. (You can do better than this half-hearted wishing of course.)

You say?

[...]

Mopping Up

Okay, reading through this I think I see where the issues are. The main one is:

- *It is literally unthinkable and meaningless to talk about an environment outside of experience, outside of that "featureless non-thing" which has no boundary, other than as a fictional narrative within experience.*

And then we have:

- We can use metaphors to construct narratives, but those narratives are also within experience. *The only thing that is true is direct experience and there is no outside to it*. Any outside you imagine, is inside. If you pay attention when you are imagining, you'll see that you are probably making "little diagrams" in space. There is no such space outside the imagining and perceiving of it.
- There is no physical construction or environment at all. You are not something that is "in" anything. Just as when you have a dream, you are not "in" the dream. Consciousness can't "move" anywhere because it is not a thing.
- Most importantly, consciousness is not an object, it is the "material" which takes on the shape of experiences. It's a messy word really; it tends to get used for "consciousness", "consciousness-of" and "self-consciousness". Really, the second two are patterns *in* consciousness. That's why it's better to use "awareness" as the "featureless non-thing".

  So there is no such thing as "a young consciousness" because it is not an object (no "a") and it is before time (no "young"). Perhaps what you are alluding to is a conscious perspective - for instance, *being-a-person-in-a-world -* but that is an experience, a pattern within awareness.

But without a context or reference point, I realise that those points might seem out of the blue, and as soon as we think about them, we can end up in the same situation again.

So I have a suggestion -

Let's Try This

Why don't we put all that stuff aside for now - because we'll spend most of our time trying to work out each others' assumption - and start "clean" from certainties:

- Let's begin from direct experience, and then build our way out from that to "worlds" and "other people" and "manifestation"? [1]

Having done that, we'll be in good position to tackle anything. It won't take long to get quite far.

[1] Importantly, where we cannot come to a conclusion about something, we will leave it open or look for an experiment to help us find a path, rather than fill in the gap by taking a metaphor as actual.

[...]

Okay, let's run through these. Excuse length. Genuinely happy to respond to any questions.

Experiences vs Thinking

In terms of *specific* experiences, I won't give any because: privacy, and it doesn't prove anything. My view is that everyone should try for themselves and see what results they get. Nobody should believe me or anyone else. *However*, experimentation shows that experience behaves like a "dumb patterning system" and that includes your experience of other people. You *always* get a result within the parameters of your thinking. This is not the same as having full dream control of course. But the limitations seems to be more "formatting-based" than to do with any co-creation. There's no limit to what you can do to other people. I don't generally arrive at conclusions by abstract thinking, I conclude from experience and experimentation. I ask: what do I definitely experience? And then I try to build up from there. It just turns out that to make a good approximation you have to get fairly abstract. Hence "the patterning of experience" and so on, which is an attempt to find the most basic, flexible metaphor that can still "make sense".

On Dividing

I do say consciousness itself inherently cannot be divided. This is self-evident from examining direct experience (that "featureless non-thing") and logic. That doesn't mean it cannot "take on the shape of" division though, which is what I'm thinking you mean? For instance, that is why you think you are "in your body" rather than "over there by the door", even though a brief pause reveals that you are everywhere.

If what you're getting at is whether there can be multiple "people" sharing a "world" then: we can only refer to our own direct experience, perhaps perform some experiments, and then come up with a model. When you do that, though, you find that this cannot be a simply-shared world. It doesn't work like a "place". The "common resource of possible experiences" model seems to strike balance between being useful, whilst avoiding falling into the usual metaphor traps. A simple way to say this is, it's like you are an open "awareness" which is having a dream about a world, and that world is *based on* a particular set of patterns or definitions drawn from a shared toy box. You have a *private copy* of the world - a world that has in effect already happened, which you are browsing the memories of.

Conscious & Sub.

> you're recognizing that your conscious self (your experience) is at least partially disconnected from the subconscious (the world providing said experience).

Actually, no, I recognise no split here. The division is only in language. There is *only* "awareness" taking on the shape of experience, and all possible experiences are always present within it. All patterns are here, now.

There can be no actual division between things. Things that are truly divided, cannot interact. They remain unknown to each other. This is another reason why the "shared resource" description solves a problem or two:

It is *obviously* true, in your experience now, that you have no boundary and there is no inside or outside to your being. This leaves the only way that *apparent* sharing can take place is via information dissolved *within* it. However, that sharing is not based on time or space, because there is no time or space outside of a particular experience. I'm not sure that last part was clear.

[...]

> it seems to me you have a very single-layer conception of the whole thing.

It might, but that is because I'm referring to things beyond conceiving of them in a spatial context (which is a way of thinking only). I say that all possible patterns are available, always, dissolved "dimesionlessly" into the background, as it were.

What you call "karma" I would call *Observation Accumulation*, the triggering of patterns into prominence which narrows the subset of *next-moment* patterns that are available. The state of your world *is* the relative contributions of the patterns that are presently activated.

In both cases, it's important not to confuse the metaphor with the underlying actuality. There are no hierarchies, layers, locations, and so on other than the conceiving of them.

> Though, given that everything is constructed of thought, I don't exactly buy into the idea that thought can't understand anything. :)

You can make parallel structures, but that is all!

Taking the sandbox analogy: say there is a castle of sand in your sandbox. You can make another shape out of sand which corresponds to that castle, alongside it. However, it will not *be* that castle, it will simply emulate it in most respects - fine. That is "understanding". More to the point though: it is not possible to use sand to make an accurate model ("understanding") of sand itself or the sandbox, because all such models *are* the sand and the sandbox. That's where we get the whole thing of the "truth" always being true, no matter what. You can't seek it, and no experience is special, all experiences are it - etc. The sand/sandbox is the reality, no matter what shape it takes. You only notice it in places where it has taken on no shape (e.g. attending to the place you are looking out from).

> Forgetting about past accumulated observations allows new patterns to be expressed with greater freedom, and this in turn helps to balance the karma.

Deleting and amending contributing patterns (accumulated observations) does indeed make things freer. *Apart* from this, what *is* "balancing karma" and what *is* "karma"?

> All distinctions: between the OS and the program; between programs; between programs that are virtual machines that run other programs; all of those distinctions are conceptual.

The difference there is that the conceptual points to an actual. "Programs", for instance, do have an underlying reality: switched states in a semiconductor. In our discussion, there is no underlying reality other than the patterns themselves. There are somehow sandcastles but no sand.

Really, this is just a way of us saying there is no *inherent* structure. Which is fun - because if you decide to go round the place with the view that the world is a computer simulation (for instance), you will very quickly start experiencing it as such, and the evidence will mount up.

And this applies more interestingly, depending on how far you want to go: If you start adopting the idea that this is a dream world, and all people are nothing but visual shapes and sounds, and there is nothing "behind" this current 3D-immersive sensory moment experience - that'll become your experience too.

So the *only* persistent truth turns out to be that conscious direct experience thing you noticed earlier. Everything else is flexible and works on an "as if it were true" basis. Like:

"However you imagine that it works, That's how it works." -- The Law of Metaphor

[...]

So, your karma experience I would "explain" in terms of patterning. Once you have had a particular experience, that is overlaid upon everything else subsequently - and when the correct context arises, it tends to be associatively triggered (you might say) or "shine through". When we introspect, we see the reoccurrence and create a narrative about it - but that narrative is a connective fiction like any other. We have to be careful (in my view) not to assign intelligence or purpose to this. It is *we* who assign purpose and meaning in the moment of contemplation.

> But you don't know this. You gaze into yourself, and you see a featureless non-thing. That's not proof that you're looking at the bottom of reality. It can be a false bottom you're seeing.

You can do that forever. So, the featureless non-thing that has no aspects or properties whatsoever other than simply being - what do you imagine is beyond that? And *where* would it be beyond it? As soon as you start doing so, we're just imagining things again *within that context*. We never get outside of it. If you can't experience it, it doesn't exist in any useful way - right? It only exists as a fictional narrative to join the dots, a narrative which itself exists within awareness.

> But I have felt people – or rather, their true selves – beyond just shape and sound.

Yes, there is a lot more to it than visuals and sounds. And *direct knowing* is one of those things. I wouldn't call that a "layer", it's another experience *at the same level*. And in fact, that "reaching out" of "presence" is a key to realising how experience is structured, I'd say. For as long as we are "localised", we tend to confuse ourselves with a location in the head, or with the body, or a bubble of space around it. If we spread out then you become more aware that it's an experience floating in space. This doesn't devalue that experience - it increases its value. It means you are directly simultaneous with the world, that it is all consciousness and it is you. (This does not of course mean the "personal" you, which is just a concept.)

Direct connection to other people is, I'd say, direct connection to a pattern. The "beingness" behind the pattern, meanwhile, *is you*. The people you encounter are revealed to be an aspect of yourself, and the "person" you think you are is also just an aspect of yourself.

Reply to “What if”

I think: the simulation concept is just how modern-day folk get their heads around the fact that there is no solid world behind the images, sounds, and textures of everyday life - and that intention is *global* rather than local. (It does more than just move your arms.)

It's all imagination. The concept behind "jumping" is pretty much that you are changing the "world-pattern" to a desired state - which is similar to the concept of "changing a line of code" or "updating a data structure". It all amounts to: updating facts, and subsequent experiences being in line with the new facts.

The problem with the simulation metaphor, though, is that it tends to encourage you to think that there is something "running" the simulation, that you are "in" something, and that other events are "happening" other than your present experience.

> Are the people arround me are just philosophical zombies or are they experiencing life like me?

They're just images, but then so is the person you assume yourself to be. No person ever experienced anything - just as no sound ever experienced music - although as consciousness you might have "person-formatted" experiences.

It goes something like this - What you are is an "open conscious space" which has "taken on the shape of" an experience, the experience of *being-a-world-from-the-perpective-of-a-person*, as a strand of thought.

This means that the world is not to be viewed as a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time", but rather a "resource", a toy box of available patterns from which you-as-conscious-space select facts, and therefore experiences. In effect, you have a private copy of the world. This gives us: that *you* are not a person either, that all apparent people are a continuous part of the environment or world-pattern, and that you are experiencing being everyone right now, in a sense.

Which leads us to: Are there no other consciousnesses, and if so do they share worlds? Well, there is only *one* consciousness (because it is "before" division, location and time), but for convenience we might think of there being '"parallel-simultaneous" experiences, each a copy of the world, not sharing a *space* but sharing a *resource*. A sort of contextual overlap.

If that seems to dodge the question, then I suppose it does: it's one of those "does not apply" things. You could always experiment with adopting the concept of "all people are aspects of me" for a while, then adopting "all people are separate individuals" for a while, and noticing how that shapes your experiences. It's more informative than trying to work through it in thought, since we hit the hurdle with it: since time and space are *part of experiences* rather than the context in which they arise, and thoughts are experiences, it is not possible to think beyond your own conscious space in its current format.

[...]

Well, I wouldn't say "just" in mind really, that sounds a bit dismissive! ;-)

The mind has no resolution; things aren't stored as data, like in a computer. If you think of each "fact" of as an unbounded pattern, then the current state of the world is the combination of all patterns. What resolution do patterns have? None. It doesn't matter how closely you look, you always see... more pattern. Because there

is no resolution, there is no limit to how much complexity can be "stored" or "dissolved into" the same space. Is there a limit to how many of those patterns I could stack up? No, because the result is always *one pattern*.

As for "saved" it's better maybe to say that things become "fixed" by observation; they become "defined". The whole landscape of patterns is already there, the relative contributions shifting around somewhat as you intend and change your views, but when you make an observation then that particular aspect becomes a "fact" and does not shift so easily anymore; its intensity and its relative contribution is heightened.

So, we have that:

- There is no resolution limit; there is no granularity involved.
- There is no "saving" in the sense of adding a piece of data into a storage facility; the entire world-pattern always exists and is eternal.
- What does happen is that the relative contributions of the component patterns varies (the relative intensity of "facts").
- When an observation is made, that "defines" or "fixes" that pattern, such that it becomes an observed fact or certainty; it has a very bright relative contribution as a fact.
- Intense patterns are not necessarily irrevocably factual; their intensity *can* be reduced again however it rarely occurs to people to try, since they seem so certain.
- The beliefs you have adopted are also effectively high-contributing patterns - "minor facts" - and so shape your experience accordingly.
- Whenever you adopt a new view of the world, the patterns associated with that view become more dominant, and your subsequent experience falls into alignment with that.
- You can create "fake observations" within the mind and have them contribute as facts just as much as a "real" observation would.

It's relatively easy to explore these ideas and test them out for yourself, to see if they are accurate or not. Spend a week "pretending" that things are a different way from how you think you know them to be, and see if things don't line up to provide you with evidence of your new approach.

Reply to “a question to Triumphant_George”

> > Without a fairly solid "method" for substantially increasing the effectiveness of calling potentialities into actuality...

But this is itself the problem, perhaps. The continual search for a "the" method is a mistake. Anything that is in sensory experience - that is, a series of actions, the experience of performing a "technique" - is *itself* a result. Methods aren't causal, at least not directly; they are simply the leveraging of a pre-existing pattern or two. The actual cause is "intention" (and the avoidance of subsequent counter-intention), which is unfortunately something which cannot be articulated, since it is "pre-conceptual" and baked into the nature of experience itself.

So, methods could be looked at as already-intensified connective structures, abstract patterns which can be leveraged be associating them with situations and outcomes, which are also structures. Things like the *Two Glasses* exercises are, then, a sort of cheat, because they leverage pre-existing meaning, and offer the possibility of getting results (at least sufficient to demonstrate there is "something going on") without having to fully "get" the intentional aspect. The focus on methods ends up with a focus on "doing", whereas to dig deeper is to recognise that doing is itself a result, and *assigned meaning* and *assertion of fact* is where to focus. One has to go "meta" on the whole thing of experience, then. It's perhaps a bit like having used your body to manipulate the world for years, pondering the best way to use your body, and then realising "wait, how have I been manipulating my body?" The specific body movements weren't the key thing to wonder about, it was the *very fact of* the movements. And this is why the subject is best presented as an investigation, experimentation and contemplation into "the nature of experiencing", "the nature of descriptions", "you", "the world", and the relationship between these.

> ...then there must be such a way to amplify effectiveness.

To turn up the relative intensity of one pattern - or network of facts - versus another, if you will. Exactly. But there is no specific and particular "method" for this, there is only intending, and thereby the intensification of one pattern's contribution to ongoing experience with the reduction of contrary patterns.

> I'm tired of long-winded theory that doesn't translate into stuff that actually works.

Yeah, that's where the focus on "the nature of descriptions" comes in. In my view, theories should be looked upon as "patterns to be used" rather than "explanations for how things are". And any long-windedness should involve collaborative deconstruction, targeting assumptions, rather than indulgent imagery (unless that imagery is specifically for *creative* use; see later). Theories are, after all, simply experiences themselves (the experience of "thinking about theories"), at the same level; they don't get "behind" experience. Theories in this context are "as if" patterns which might be adopted for use; there is no actual "how things are" or "how things work" beyond that. The only fundamental fact is the fact of experiencing - of the property of *being-aware* or "awareness". Everything else is relatively true only. And so the search for "the" theory or "the" method is immediately a lost cause.

"Understanding" something, then, doesn't necessarily lead to any results. If one adopts the pattern of a model (via intention or implication) then once might have experiences "as if" it were true, but the model itself isn't pointing to anything fundamental. Hence the concept of "active metaphors" referenced in the side bar.

Anyway, the larger point, with which you'll probably agree, is we need to be very clear when it comes to 'theories' and 'methods' generally, and more specifically we need to focus on what theories and methods *are*, in relation to experience.

I think it's that spirit of investigation, in the absence of a full commitment to direct intention, that is ultimately beneficial - which is why I regularly return to the idea of this being an exploration, rather than a sort of "technology" with a particular underlying structured 'material' (or 'spiritual') mechanism. Otherwise people are at risk of taking a "cargo cult" approach to the subject (that is, emulating the visible actions only, while never grasping the "motive").

The "demo" exercises, then, are just a starting point, giving you a sense that here is something to this, and a possible avenue of investigation: the *Two Glasses* and the *Owls of Eternity* exercises are based on the two basic types of structure one might use. There will never be "the" method, because methods are themselves expressions of the insights gained about "you" and "the world" during that investigation.

> Simply being told to "intend" or to understand myself in one or another variant as experientially transparent (and so on) isn't helping.

Quite so. In terms of discussion, with the causal aspect, it's like trying to explain someone (or to yourself) how you lift your arm (when you are deliberately redirecting away from the current path of movement, not just spontaneous steps along the way to another outcome). Or think about a red car. It's just there. You just... become the experience of it. And in experimenting, it's quite possible that you just end up generating lots of other experiences (like synchronicities) rather than the target experience. This is a better starting point for a conversation, perhaps: That is, with the "form" of an intention - the "idea" we seek to make more prominent in experience - we *can* make some headway. Key to this, I'd say, is the recognition that all intention is "direct". In other words, you are not "over here" intending something "over there". Treating it in that way, tends to work against us. Rather, you are pulling up a pattern by the bootstraps, everywhere. In a sense, you seek to literally "overwrite" the current experience with a differently-patterned one. Condense "this fact" from the background, in preference to "that fact".

> At times I veer towards the belief that a profound deranger is the only thing powerful enough to shift some habitualized center of gravity in the deep mind

Well, in a sense, that is right. If everything, the whole current deterministic state or landscape, is "dissolved" into the background of this moment, available for update - and if the only causal power is "reshaping the landscape" via intention in *exactly the same way* as deciding to life your arm operates, then we might ask: what is it that is being missed, if there is no actual mechanism behind things (no "behind" at all), that means I struggle to shift facts?

The property of "directness" is one possible important aspect overlooked, I'd say. If you don't do, but only become, then all that matters is that one *fully enters into* a state. You can't "try" to do this, or you enter the state of "trying to enter a state". You can't be "over here" attempting to enter a state "over there", because that means you inherently remain separate from it, not entering or becoming. Ultimately, you are "taking on the shape of" a state or experience, and that must be done with "full intensity" (except when we're just talking about "plausible but unlikely", non-rule-breaking, occurrences, perhaps leveraging pre-existing patterns, such as *Two Glasses* brings about).

Let's say that one of the "fact-patterns" of one's current state is "inertia" or "solidity". Let's say that the situation right now can be described as: you can move your arms simply by intending "it is true *now* that my arm moves *then*" (the "arm movement" pattern) and due to lack of conflict the relative intensity of even a minor holding of that pattern, because that gets it integrated into your state. If we want to do something more dramatic, though - something more like a shift in the *facts-of-the-world*, it will require "holding" for longer. But far would we go to check if it is possible?

Would we hold for an hour? A day? A week? Perhaps a month? Gradually the obstructing, contrary patterns would dissolve out as the held pattern became primary and conflicting patterns were implicitly removed from contributing. Or perhaps we might, instead of focusing on our outcome, we might focus on the "meta" patterns surrounding it. That is, for as long as the patterning of "the world is an extended place unfolding in time", that would tend to structure your ongoing experience against dreamlike, associative type apparent events. This would be the "weaker the rules" approach, you might say. The ultimate version of this might be patterning oneself with something like the "imagination room" metaphor listed in the sidebar, or the variations described in the "owls of eternity" exercise.

So, that was a bit meandering, but the general notion is: We can't talk about the ultimate cause, because it's basically like "shape-shifting", however we might be able to talk about useful patterns (e.g. "active metaphors") to play with, since undoubtedly this (apparently) *being-a-person-in-a-world* experience consists of a certain set of patterns already - a common starting point for shared investigation. (Putting aside for the moment the issues we hit regarding "shared" worlds.)

> ...death, trauma, kidnap, the world's most powerful psychedelics, etc.

The apparent power of these, I suggest, in terms of their ability to crack open experience, lies in the fact that there is no particular logical *next-step* that follows from them?

> The lifting your arm example is interesting, because while the core of it is mysterious, nature still has a whole bunch of specific patterns for achieving it

What is this "nature" of which you speak? For certain, lifting your arm is a pattern of experience - a *patterning of* experience, which one summons or becomes, by essentially recalling the "idea" of it, an idea which is incorporated into the overall sensory experience when one does so. (Whether it is brought fully into the senses or not, though, the idea still exists, and is experienced.)

It is not actually mysterious as such. You know perfectly well how your arm moves. The apparent mystery is when one confuses "knowing" with "creating a set of conceptual objects and forming a coherent description out of them". But that doesn't "explain" arm movement: it simply produces a parallel experience in thought (the experience of "thinking about some concepts I've called 'how arm movement works').

> This is why I implied...perhaps it is more like a "knack" sort of like juggling or riding a bicycle.

I guess you're trying to articulate the idea that one can't conceptualise and communicate, as objects and words, certain experiences, but that doesn't necessarily matter from a personal perspective - one knows these things *directly*, because one *is* the doing. You don't need to have a description of seeing in order to see, for example. You just *are* the experience of seeing.

Similarly, arm movement just *is*, and it is known by recalling the idea, as a sensory experience or a thought experience (these differ only in spatial location in experience, though). There is nothing behind it. And the same applies to the description, too. Adding more experiences at the same level doesn't get "behind" any experience - there *is* no "behind".

Now, at this point you may say something like...

> My overall concern is with practical outcome While the theory is interesting...

However, we need to specify what is meant by "theory" here. The above isn't "theory", for example. Rather, it's an attempt to capture in words the direct observation of experience, as it is experienced. Unlike talking about, say, "nature" as a thing behind the scenes whose mechanism is responsible for bringing about our experience, our talk here of "patterns" is simply to draw attention to the properties of structured experience itself *and to emphasise there is no "behind"*. The distinction we're drawing here is between *thinking-about* experience, and recognising *thinking-about* as another experience, with the same properties, which never "explains" anything - *but can still be used to construct patterns which can later be used as intentional contexts*. That is, used "practically". Ultimately, the distinction between "theory" and "practical" falls away, as does the distinction between "literal" and "metaphorical", because they both turn out to be exactly the same thing.

By way of this, of course, we find a link between the idea of "pathways" and "outcomes":

> A pathway to lifting that spoon "directly with my mind" as we would say (i.e. without using an arm or a tool) does not seem to have any established pathway and is in a sense "rogue."

They are identical in nature.

But if we don't spend time actually attending to experience, to establish that fully for ourselves, then none of that matters much perhaps. What sense is there in talking about "practical" is we don't know what "practical" is, or what an "outcome" really is?

(Intermission, from previous discussion:)

Feeling Out Exercise

... a little exercise can help give us a direct experience of what it means to be the subject to all experience, to recognise that we are not an object and that we are "unlocated". We might close our eyes and try to:

a) find the "edges" of your current experience.
b) find where "you" are in your current experience. *and:*
c) investigate what your current is experience is "made from". *finally:*
d) think about yourself, and then note the location of that thought and what it is "made from".

The conclusions of this are the *direct facts* of your experience - the only actual facts, really; everything else is transitory. Whatever you *think about* your experience is also another experience within this context. You can never get "behind" or "outside" of this, because it has not edges or boundaries; there *is* no behind or outside. (If you think otherwise, then pause and notice that your thought about this is *also* "within" and "inside".)

Now, to tie the two strands together - the dissolving of the theory and the practical, and the description and the "knack" - we need to get a handle on what you might call "intentional context".

Ultimately, this is simple: that if you attend to your direct experience, for sure there's the "object" bit, the localised stuff you can draw on paper or think about systematically, but also there's the "knowing" or "meaning" which is sort of non-located, "dissolved" everywhere, inseparable from it. The relevance to "outcomes" is that without the contextual aspect asserted, object-based activities are (literally) meaningless.

(Further intermission, from extended discussion elsewhere:)

Intentional Context Exercise

So, first imagine a sphere in front of you - say, a blue sphere with no particular detail, just floating there. Okay, now imagine a sphere in front of you, identical in every way to the first, except also imagine that this sphere is imbued with the special power to make the room filled with joy. *But do not change the sensory aspect of the sphere in any way when you do this.*

This is basically "imagining the fact of something being true" abstractly. That is, that an object, or your ongoing experience more generally, has a property, without actually visualising any sensory aspects to that property. Instead of doing all the "sensory theatre" of picturing stuff, in an effort to associatively trigger the fact or as an excuse to do so, you can just *directly* do intending-asserting of the fact into greater prominence.

Finally, after taking a pause to clear yourself out a little, instead of using the sphere image, simply *directly intend* that the room is filled with joy, and experience the result of that. That is, wordlessly intend the fact of: "it is true now that this room is filled with joy". And, um, *enjoy*.

The suggestion here is that since experience is *direct* - you *are* your experience, you are "that which takes on the shape of" experiences and there is no "outside" to you - then with any method you do, you are actually playing out the entire thing as a sort of "sensory theatre". And that's all outcomes actually are: desired moments of sensory theatre, with meaning. In effect, the only way to have something become fact, is to fully *imagine-that* (to "take on the shape of" the pattern or experience of) it being a fact. Imagining that you are "over here" trying to change something "over there" is like a little play; the *entire experience* is imaginative.

> But it feels subjectively similar to trying to pick up a metal bar with an ultra ultra weak magnet?

Directly imagine being a strong magnet, then! :-)

In short, then: "theory" is a type of "outcome", and talk of being practical is meaningless unless it is clearly seen that the "literal" and "metaphorical (that is, sensory experience and descriptions of sensory experience) are the same. However, one pseudo-practical route is to attend to one's direct experience as it is, in addition to experimenting with direct or indirect intentional strategies.

> You do seem to have a fondness for these abstractions, TriumphantGeorge.

Well, no, not at all really. What do you mean by an "abstraction" and what do you mean by "lingering in practicality" (one might ask)? Without clearly defining those things, we end up with not even abstraction - merely obfuscation (albeit not deliberate).

And, **you really cannot get more practical and direct than the two exercises I included in the last comment.** Did you do them?

One has to actually perform them: in my experience, people tend to *think-about* such things rather than actually engage with them on their own terms (or at all), just as people rarely actually commit to any line of intentional focus in order to experiment. They tend to want a sort of conceptual coherence or pre-guarantee in thought, but of course that's rather part of the issue. Again: there is no method or "way it works", so the "abstractions" I might suggest are actually *patterns to adopt*, rather than concepts to *think-about*. The point is that if one want to have things, "solutions" or "outcomes", defined in the terms of one's current everyday assumptions, then one is already lost. *Because those assumptions, that patterning, is exactly the problem we face.*

That is, if by "practical" what we mean it that we want something to "do" - like a sort of physical action that will make things happen, that still builds upon the notion of ourselves as some sort of "person object" that is in a "world" that is a "stable, simply-shared, spatially-extended place unfolding in time" - you'll eventually hit a barrier and realise that such actions are already "too late". Such actions are yet more "experiences" and have no causal power, and instead *adopting abstractions as fact* might be, in a sense, the way forward.

> I'm guessing, I suppose, that you prefer talking about those than lingering in practicality.

One might note that "prefer talking" equates to "prefer typing" when it comes to online conversation. On evidence, it could seem to me that you "prefer typing"? Of course, it's not really a preference - *it's what conversation is*. Nobody can do another's exercises or insights for them. So this is all we have, here. Talking. Discussion. *About* insights, but not in themselves insights. "Pointing at the moon." It's like saying that a diarist "prefers writing" rather than living, simply because the record of his life, for others, exists only in text?

Some people *do* prefer reading, though. (Which is fine, of course.) But then, you didn't really engage with any of the content of my reply, at all?

> there is an insufficient communication channel established between my waking or "surface" self and some much deeper substratum of my being

This is the ultimate in "theory" or abstraction. Have you ever encountered a "deeper substratum" of your being? Or indeed a "waking" self as distinct from some other self? Directly, I mean. Besides, that is, simply *thinking-about* such a thing. For me, this subject really comes down to one single insight, and realising the rest (*all* the rest) is, yes, in a sense talk. But that applies globally, perhaps, to everything that can be discussed at all. Al conversation stops, if we truly commit to that as purity.

Can pick this up tomorrow and address your points more clearly if you like. Really, the most fruitful avenue of discussion is probably on the relationship (if that is even the right concept) between "doing" and "experiencing". Noting along the way, of course, that the very fact of encoding stuff into "conversation" immediately removes us from what we're trying to discuss!

[...]

Knacks & Doings

> Again, it's my experience that some people have a "knack" for these things...meaning that a process is going on that is not identical across different "meditators" who follow identical instructions.

Hmm. Well, quite specifically these are not meditations or processes, but it's certainly true that there is a "knack" in the sense of trying to notice something that you haven't yet noticed or thought about.

It is just "there", but it is in the manner of, say, noticing "redness" as distinct but also inherent to a red object. It's like a fact that is there, but you are "looking through it". I'm wary of using the word "knack" because it often implies a skill, in inherent talent. But there is no talent to this; it is always there, and is always a fact (actually the *only* fundamental fact). A further problem, of course, is that putting it into words (as with all putting-into-words), is unhelpful without the experience to accompany it, since the words are pointing to an experience, and absent the experience the descriptions seem abstract and meaningless (which they are, previously). This loops back to our comments on theory and "talk", earlier.

> In other words, missing variables...as I implied earlier.

I'd disagree with that, or at least I'd say it's potentially a misleading idea, since it implies there is some sort of hidden structure to uncover, some secret set of facts or a mechanism. Instead, here, we are talking about the context to all such facts - the *context* or all *content*.

> The verb in that suggests that people are actually doing something, are achieving that something, or at the very least that it is achievable in principle.

The sense in which one isn't "doing" something is in particular way. I don't mean that one isn't or cannot change one's experience. The point is that if one "jumps", then one is not truly translating one's body into literally pre-existing realities which are divided into "dimensions". It is not "the dimensions what did it". However, one can have an experience "as if" that is happening, just as right now one is having an experience "as if" one is a person in a world (one has "taken on the shape of" apparently *being-a-person-in-a-world*). And that is enough. That wasn't very clear, probably. What I'm trying to highlight is that all there is, is "experiencing", and regardless of the content of "an experience", there is nothing permanent behind it, other than the fact of "experiencing". (See: the *Feeling Out Exercise* earlier.)

Ultimately, then, we are noticing that experience is like a shape or pattern in liquid, which - even if it is of "a solid world" or of "jumping dimensions" - has no underlying supporting structure. It's cliche to say it, but "the water" (which is oneself, non-personal) is the only permanent fact, and the "ripple patterns" are just relative disturbances. Furthermore, any descriptions one comes up with *about* those patterns are just themselves patterns, more experiences. There is no depth to them; they are in parallel.

Again, this sounds obscure or even wilfully opaque, but it's much clear if you take a moment to notice your experience, as per that exercise for instance. Without that, one is simply building "castles in the sky": descriptions which might be coherent and self-consistent, but have no foundation, being as they are merely unmoored thoughts *within* the things they would try to be *about*. This is why we might tend to resort to metaphors which try to be "meta" and about experience itself, rather than any content (for example: the beach, the blanket, patterned states, and so on).

But let's get on to a perhaps more fruitful line of thought:

Dreams, Intentions & Meta

> [Deeper substratum] Well...I would say that we encounter such a substratum every night when we dream.

Would you say that dreams are "deeper"? I think the actual experience of dreams doesn't involve any hierarchy or levels. The content is *different* certainly, but the experience is not different in its nature.

> I think some kind of discussion of will is missing here. Intention is just a fancy word for will at the end of the day.

Actually, the word "intention" gets used over the word "will" deliberately, since the latter tends to imply one entity exerting influence over another. Meanwhile, "intention" is nearer to the desired meaning, that of a static idea or pattern which one would like to bring into play. There is no good word for this, though, because we are talking about something which is "before" objects and events.

The way I tend to use the term, is this: "intending" is the increasing of the relative contribution of a particular pattern to one's ongoing experience; "an intention" is the pattern (fact or outcome or 'idea' or something more abstract) that one is increasing the relative contribution of.

The is a little circular, but that is the nature of it: there is not "you" who is "doing" intending onto a "world"; instead it is a shaping of oneself as the experiencer, or "awareness", or "that which takes on the shape of states and experiences". The possible rejection of the term "will" comes from this requirement to avoid a sense of division and of objects operating on one another.

> I just don't think that we know all the variables acting. But this should be seen as the beginning of an exploration and not the end of one.

I don't know about "variables", but it's true that exploration is ongoing, in the sense the one uncovers and perhaps amends the patterning of one's experience. However, the main insight as regards the context is one and done: there is nothing more to be done with that. Really, this is that experience is "imagined" and to change it one must "imagine-that" it is different, directly.

Not everyone is interested in that, in what seems to be philosophical musings, though. However, *without* that, there are difficulties, I'd say, because there's a tendency to want to acquire a particular outcome while still defining it in terms of (implying within the intention) a "format" of the world as a "stable, simply-shared, spatially-extended place unfolding in time". Rather than something more flexible, such as "a sequence of sensory moments recalled from a memory" or "an imagination space within which patterns are drawn", or whatever.

This "meta" intending is where one really gets exploring: intending the *structuring* of experiential content, rather than just intending outcomes. But, again, I really think there's not much point to that if we are content-focused only. This is because then we're still looking for a "how it works, really" by attending to our experiences - and there's a big problem with that, since we tend to have experience which are implied by our own looking.

The results can be useful, of course. After all, if one has a dream of discovering a useful machine, and the machine works in the dream "as if" it can cause desired changes, then even though the machine doesn't *really* have any causal power (the experience of "the machine" and of "the machine working" are both just patterns; the state of the dreamer), it can still be utilised. The problem only arises if the machine is confused as being "how dreams work", when actually it is *the fact of the dream itself* - of "experience" more generally - that is the "how things work".

Dreams are good to ponder though, I think!

What are dreams made from?
What is it that experiences a dream?
If one has a lucid dream and makes changes, what exactly is making the changes and what is it really changing?

And so on.

...This has probably drifted a little, I suppose. That's inevitable, though, when we're probably talking at slightly cross purposes, and part of our conversation is really about feeling out what we mean by various terms, and what our differing underlying assumptions might be. And we likely differ on the idea of the "nature of experience" more generally, I guess.

Now, I don't think anyone necessarily needs to think things through so deeply, though, but instead of that they need a certain bloody-mindedness and blind faith in order to commit and/or to persist without holding back. As in lucid dreams or visualising, it's not so much the doing as the full commitment to the outcome, without reservation?

> It's that you have to take yourself to a point where you accept the metaphysical fact as being equal to a physical fact.

That'll do! Or, perhaps, just stop worrying about that completely, is another option, accepting things at face value (so that your worldview amounts to something like "I am an experiencer within which a series of sensory moments appears" and formulate intentions in terms of that, thus avoiding re-implying other patterns).

Basically, we're talking about taking "one step back" from the discussion we're having right now. Even talking about "the subconscious" realm is *already* using or implying a pattern which is "too late" for what we're dealing with here. We're talking about *patterning itself*.

To pick up on one point, though:

The sense in which there is no method, is that there is no *particular* method, in terms of an act one might take. This isn't to say there aren't currently present patterns that you might leverage, though.

For example, we might say that the *Two Glasses* leverages the patterns of "translation and transformation" and "volumes and intensity", and moving your arm leverages a whole "body" postural pattern, and there are lots of more abstract patterns that we use, and so on. The pattern of "I am an object located in a world which like a 'place' which unfolds in time" is a more basic one, still.

However, *those patterns aren't fundamental*. This includes the "world" one. And *patterns don't cause anything*, rather they are the current state of experience. The only cause of change is intention, which is to say, selecting a pattern into experience.

As you note, in your wording, doesn't it seem that there "forces" operating against us?

The way forward, then, for major change isn't to leverage existing patterns (that is, intending the pattern "it is true *now* that my arm moves *then*" and the rest being just the existing postural pattern as the "auto-completed" extension of that), it is to *amend* patterns as well.

But the "method" remains simply intention. It's just that the target (or better to say: the pattern being intended, intensified) is different, is more general.

To further clarify: For the sake of argument, we might say that all possible patterns exist eternally, are always "true" to some extent, we might say that patterns vary only in their relative intensity, or strength of contribution to experience. We might also say that at any moment, the world must "make sense" - that is, be an overall coherent pattern.

If this is so, and we have a *very* strong pattern of "I am an object in a solid spatial, temporal world", then, like the arm-movement intention which is done in the context of the body posture, our intentions are structured by the context of that pattern. A synchronicity might arise here and there through the gaps and feel a bit dreamlike, but not much more than that. A reason to persist in that, though, is that the more one has synchroncity and recognises the meaning of that, the more one's intentions with will tend to intensify the pattern of "the world is dreamlike" as a byproduct, an implication.

However, from what we're saying above, *we could just go for intending the pattern "the world is dreamlike" directly*.

This is like changing our "posture" such that the manner of our "arm movement" changes, becomes more flexible. (And this is actually a way to change your bodily posture and movement - of course, because it's all the same thing, all just patterns of experience.)

Putting it together:

So we could summarise that with something like the following, jumping ahead a bit admittedly:

- The only fundamental fact is the fact of *being-aware* or "awareness".
- All other facts are temporary and relative, as patterns in awareness.
- All possible patterns exist, eternally, and are available right now. (You can conceive of them as being "dissolved into the background" of this ongoing moment, now.)
- What you actually are, is "awareness" which has "taken on the shape of" a set of patterns = a "state".
- A "state" fully defines our experience, completely. That is, it defines all moments over all time, deterministically, between shifts.
- To shift one's state, one simply "intends" a pattern, and that pattern then becomes more prominent in the state, and so in our ongoing sensory experience. This is like a "shape-shifting", a movement of oneself as "awareness". There is no way to describe this or explain it; it is a "becoming" rather than a "doing".
- One can conceive of the experience of apparently *being-a-person-in-a-world* as a single pattern, a "world-pattern", which is always self-consistent (between updates, that is).
- If your world-pattern has a strong component of "I am an object in a solid stable world" then any additional minor patterns you intend such as "I will get healthy again" will be incorporated within that context (and, in some cases, will just arise as dreams plus a couple of synchronicities, rather than main outcomes).

- To improve the quality of outcomes, one should consider intending the context directly, such as "the world is dreamlike, fluid, and symbolic".

Roughly, then: no facts are fundamental, intention is the only cause or method, conceiving of the world as a pattern of patterns is one of the most flexible positions to adopt - and the world is a "shape" that you take on, directly.

One further implication of the "directness" of all this, is that:

- It is very important to fully decide and declare that it is a fact that your outcome is going to happen ("it is true *now* that this happens *then*"), either directly or by implying it in some way. [1]

Essentially, one must actually decide *what* is going to happen, and *that* it is going to happen, because it is this deciding or asserting which makes (is!) the change. Without that, any apparent method becomes simply an activity - in effect, an intention only to have the experience of performing a ritual, a bit of "sensory theatre".

It's rather like the difference between intending to" tense your arm muscles against an object in order to move it", versus "intending to move the object into a new position". They are quite distinct things. (A good exercise for this, is to challenge a friend to an arm wrestle. First, proceed by intending to "use your muscles to move your arm". Then, instead proceed by "intending that it is true that you win the arm wrestle". Note the difference.)

[1] It occurs to me to add, for clarity, that of course when we say things like "intend that 'it is true *now* that this happens *then*'", we don't mean that we should verbalise or think the words. Rather, we're referring to attending to the pattern that this statement would describe. Whilst saying words, or visualising images, does bring to mind that pattern just by association (which is the experience of having the "meaning" of the words or image), when we intend we just go for it directly - otherwise we are often just intensifying the experience of saying or thinking the words, rather than intensifying what the words mean or the fact-pattern they point to. There is no particular sensory experience associated with intending, we just "know" that we are doing so. The except to that is, of course, if the intention is something that would have an impact on our current moment, because then we will experience the result - for example, if we intend that "it is true *now* that my body is becoming completely relaxed", or in the case of the blue sphere exercise, that "the blue sphere *means-that* it is true *now* that I am feeling joyful". (Plainly, this is all much more complex in the description than in the doing: hence experimenting with the *Feeling Out* and *Intentional Context* exercises, say, is better than a discussion *about* it, since they *are* it.)

[...]

(This got quite long, perhaps we should pick one single point of contention and expand on it, but remembering that descriptions don't really matter much, because this isn't something for which one generates 'explanations'. It may be that "intention", for example, might be better termed "direct imagination", for you, and that it is better starting with exploring exactly how that relates to body movements, rather than jumping straight to discussion about "facts of the world" and so on. Meanwhile: have you ever ***actually*** *taken the time to "intend that the Earth has two moons"? Closed your eyes, just intended the fact of that for just ten minutes? Worth doing, I'd say.)*

"Nature" & Patterning

> I think that nature has a “patterning”...a fullness as well as an emptiness

We return here to "what is nature?", though (it is a concept) and from there we see that the "fullness-emptiness" issue is an aspect of our description, not of *things-as-they-are*?

Is a better way to say this, perhaps, that "*my ongoing experience* has a level patterning of which seems stable and unchanging, a *formatting* which seems more resistant to change"?

Prominence, Descriptions, Hidden Variables

> But what about when it is doesn’t become prominent?

It's a metaphor. There isn't really an "it" that is there when it isn't prominent. "Patterning" is just (I suggest) the most basic sort of description we can have of structured experience. But it *is* just a description. The description itself is just another experience you can have (the experience of "thinking about experience"). We can have experiences "as if" that experience is true, but you can't actually describe what is true at all - because it is just: the very fact of "experiencing". That's why I say it's not an explanation of experience, because it is inherently not possible to have an explanation of experience (since "experience" is that from which all explanations are "made", in a manner of speaking).

It's also why I say we have to just put thinking aside (since thinking is object-based), and notice our experience as it is, directly - and realise that what we are is the *subject* to all experience. When doing this, we also notice something important: that concepts of something outside of the current experience are themselves mental objects within experience. The idea of "all patterns dissolved in the background" is a matter of convenience, a bookmark. The direct experience is that "we never experience what we don't experience", and so it is *meaningless* to talk of non-prominence. Because even if you are just *thinking about* an object, that is also a prominent pattern, just not within the main strand of experience (the 1st-person "me in a world" strand). Both the *thinking-about* and the main strand are arising within and of *you-as-awareness*. They differ in location, not in kind. *The thought of non-prominence is itself a prominence!*

Your "hidden variables" are a bookmark of this type also. But any experience you have of "hidden variables" will just be another experience - and *they will not be causal*, therefore. They will be *content*, they will be a "result".

It later occurred to me you might mean something of the form "where is a fact when I am not directly experiencing it?". But I would say, in this description, that you always *are* directly experiencing it, as a background that is always there, just not unfolded as a sensory aspect. In a similar way as you can "know" your current situation, even though you haven't unpacked the "knowing" into words, and pictures, and so on. The parts of the world you aren't experiencing in the senses, and the "infinite eternal gloop of all patterns" of the

background, are both always there, and you are always experiencing them, as *you-as-awareness* having adopted a state which consists of *you-as-awareness* (empty!) as all possible patterns (full!) at relative contribution (empty and full!).

Simplicity & Problems

> It's just not that simple. If it were, everybody would be doing this successfully all the time.

That's good point, of course. But the way in which it is not simple (going with our little model for the moment) isn't in the *causation*, it's in the patterns or ideas we choose to intensify.

A few of thoughts:

First: Because everything is *direct* (because there is only *you-as-awareness* and no outside to that) then the full context of the intention matters. As we were discussing previously, just verbalising or visualising isn't sufficient, it is the *assigned meaning* of that which also matters. More accurately, the pattern you intend has to *actually be the fact you wish to intensify*. It can't be a pattern *about* the fact, it must be directly that target fact, or a fact which in turn implies the target fact.

Second, and related to the first: There is not "you-over-here" intending "pattern-over-there". Intending or implying any pattern which consist of a division of this sort, is problematic. This is really a restatement of the notion that you must actually intend the outcome you want *as* the outcome, and not a relationship *with* the outcome.

Finally, all intentions have a context, a sort of structure they are formulated in terms of, and they re-imply that context. So, in everyday life, if you intend to change direction walk "over there", then that intention is in terms of a certain idea of the world - as a "place" or whatever, that is solid, and so on. Or you interrupt yourself to intend taking a certain route because it is well-lit and "the world is a dangerous place". This can be an issue.

Aside - We should forget hypnotists and the like and "other" people, I suggest, except as a sort of in-experience narrative. This is best handled as a 1st-person perspective topic. We should be careful, really, about "people" and "everybody", because in a sense neither they nor you, as a "person", are causal agents. Apparently *being-a-person-in-a-world* is an experience you have, a formatting; it is not what you are. This brings us back to the impossibility of writing a full description, though, because there is not many *or* one "awareness*es*" - there is just "awareness", which is "before" division and objects and change.

Patterns & Practicality

So, "getting practical", we have a couple of ways in which it is "not that simple", for sure.

One is that the intention is incorporated into a pre-existing formatting, and we may need to intend modifications to the formatting (intending that the world is more dreamlike and flexible, or adopting a specific model such as the "moments of memory" model).

Another is that really the intention, to get the structure and relationship right, should be formulated in terms of you being "the subject to all experience" - a sort of unbounded container within which a strand of sensory experience or thought is unfolding - rather as a person-object located within a world.

The final problem is that we want to avoid implying the old situation when we are intending a new one, or after doing so. People try to get around this by going into a very relaxed state, or perhaps intending as they go to sleep, using those as times of "non-obstruction".

Ideally, though, one goes beyond that "trance or sleeping" approach and adopts the attitude of "letting things be however they are" always (basically "non-doing"). Then, instead of reacting to the unfolding content of the moment - thereby perhaps counter-intending and therefore re-implying, say, a "solid limited world" concept or whatever - one has adopted a stance of spontaneous flow and "allowing". Then, we are ceasing to interfere except with very occasional, specific intentions as "updates".

This means letting bodily movements and mental thoughts unfold by themselves also, of course - not just the surrounding environment - because those are part of the experience of "the world".

For this last bit, when we first do it, there's often a lot of odd "stuck movements and incomplete thoughts" which seems arise, so there's definitely room for some sort of daily releasing exercise where one practices this "letting go" approach. Not because one gets better at it, but because one's posture is likely coiled and held, and there's some crazy spasming (or more) until one lets them play out. Until then, it's quite possible that one is spending a lot of time counter-intending this "open attention" movement, and thereby (since body and world are one pattern) effectively opposing *all* movement of one's state of experience, by implication. (Such a daily releasing can either be passive, or you can intend being "open" to direct it. There's a link in the introduction post which mentions both.)

Aside - People often do "meditation" in the hope of either realising the nature of experience, or for stabilising or clearing their ongoing experience. My feeling is that, when it comes to the former there are better ways to do it than passive meditation (it's pure luck whether you accidentally have an experience which leads you to notice, a deliberate investigation is much better). Meanwhile, for the latter you need to be quite clear about the *target formatting* you are after rather than just concentrating on one sensation or idea or whatever - and if you're going to spend the rest of the day in resistance and scatter-gun intending and implying, you'd be better tackling *that* instead.

> Let me emphasize: this is not about contention for me, but about practicality.

Well, the contention would be our differences in how we think things to be, or the way in which we think about them; that is what we are exploring.

> Also, I'll simply lift the points from your post that speak to me, so I wouldn't worry about length.

This isn't often the best way to proceed, I'd say, since lifting the points that speak to us often aren't the points where progress is made, it's usually in the areas or assumptions being overlooked - this applies to my understanding of what you are saying, too. So it's often better to take a single strand, and pursue it thoroughly.

Notably, there's a couple of points I definitely haven't got across properly in previous comments, based on your "manifestation" and "meaningless of non-prominence" responses, which tie back to what it means to describe an experience (or experience a description).

And the points you have engaged with have tended not to be the ones that matter, I'd say - quite possibly due to the bloat of the conversation, and quite possibly because I have not successfully made them seem to matter!

So we need to take a step back, to continue.

> To what end, though? I don't particularly want the Earth to have two moons.

To test it! To see what happens with such an "ambitious" intention. Otherwise...

> The former is indeed easier to realize, in my opinion, because it can slide between the gaps in much looser-habit patterns that mostly pertain only to the intending individual, and which do not impact others with paradox or a fundamental change in the experienced world applicable everywhere.

...otherwise this is meaningless. As you say, it's just an opinion, based on untested assumptions about "others", the nature of "the world". Even saying "the intending individual" is problematic (because it is not clear at all that "the individual" intends anything).

Much of your comments appear to suffer from the same issue. You are stating things based on a description of the world which, I am suggesting, is not (necessarily) the case. More to the point, based on assumptions about *ongoing experience* which are fairly easily examined - if you were to choose to do so (as per exercises in previous comment, for example).

The reason to try to "manifest" things you don't necessarily care about, is *exactly* to manifest things you don't necessarily care about - to experiment and investigate the properties of experience. Otherwise you're just talking about perceived likelihood, for example, while fulfilling the prophecy through selective action.

> And to the best of my (conscious) ability I do indeed try to envision the world as more dream-like and malleable.

Perhaps we could use this as our seed, to clarify what we're actually talking about here, and from what position. (Assuming you want to continue.) So I'd kick off by asking:

- How, exactly, have you gone about doing this? (To the extent one can articulate such a thing, of course.)
- How would you describe what "you" are, what "the world" is, and what the relationship is between those?

And also I'd suggest you try the *Feeling Out Exercise* and the *Intentional Context Exercise* and offer your perspective on the experiences. Because without that (or something similar) there is no anchor to our discussion, since my descriptions are pointing to something you've never examined, and so for you they are just a bunch of words addressed to nowhere.

> I've tried it with other things that haven't worked, so it is not untested.

The point was to examine more closely the way one attempts to do it, and the way in which it doesn't work.

In terms of a conceptual framework, we've already covered a way of understanding why, say, you don't just decide to turn a house into a mouse, and have it happen. Specifically, I went into one way of conceptualising the nature of that apparent "inertia" and how - if - we can address it.

> Not really. I'm suggesting things based on empirical accountability.

You are suggesting things based on an interpretation of your experience (which is fine), and I was attempting to discuss the context of experiences more generally - how to examine that directly, and its implications for both understanding our everyday experience and the possibility of "unusual change", and then proceed to how we might tackle particular changes.

So far (quite possibly due to my own style of writing of course), we've gained no momentum on the key points, largely because I've failed to engage you in the areas I think we need to explore in order to get a better perspective on the "why can't I just change a house into a mouse" factor. Your replies have tended to be restatements of a certain point omitting what I think were the important parts of my responses that address that point, for example.

It's not clear, for instance, that what you mean by "intention" is what I am referring to by that term (it is not a the same as a "wanting" or "asking" or "willing"). And your suggestion that I was referring to, say, altering "perception" rather than "really" creating change means that I've not successfully conveyed what I mean by the directness of experience.

I concluded the last comment with a possible path to opening out the conversation, by connecting it to some specific questions and activities. You've not responded to those, but that was a way to ground our discussion so we'd no longer be talking past one another.

It may be that our conversational styles just not a good match when it comes to this topic. Or it may be that you've actually decided that "this doesn't work" and this is due to "hidden variables", and aren't interested in exploring an angle other than one based upon that idea. (Perhaps you find particularly unappealing a perspective based on a philosophy that sees these ideas as relatively useful for leveraging, but otherwise basically fundamentally meaningless.) Either is fine, of course, but it does mean we're not going to be getting anywhere with this!

[...]

> > I think he just wants to know what you personally can do. He wants to clarify if you have been able to experiece dimensional jumping in a way that cant possibly be explained by the solid world model. Its about the person,triumphantgeorge himself. Like are you basing this on personal experience or not, and if so, describe something which yiu experienced that couldn,t have been a a coincidence like willing a continent in existence.

Perhaps. What good would that do, though? I'm just some (apparent) bloke on the internet - strictly speaking, a bunch of words arising within his experience, an aspect of his own patterning! Another story for someone to read! :-)

Slight joking aside, it's very much a personal investigation of oneself, this; it doesn't really matter what other people *seem* to do. Hence, trying to return to a particular direct experience everyone can have immediately (feeling out; intentional context) so we've got something shared and immediate to talk about, then take it from there (especially since focusing on the "philosophical" aspect wasn't taking).

As per the sidebar, the subreddit isn't really about convincing someone about something - more of a: try this, contemplate the implications, now push it further, and discuss. And if someone doesn't get anything out of

it, if it seems to them that there is nothing to it then, of course, they should dismiss it and move on. (As a moderator, I try to be *sort of* agnostic and more of a prompter than anything else.) Although:

There are two things to consider in all this: a) noticing the nature of experience as it is; b) investigating our ability to change it. The first, I think, is always accessible. (And in turn hopefully changes one's ideas and approach regarding the latter; but it does require that someone actually looks.)

[...]

> I'm not convinced that you have an answer, and you know what... because I don't think anyone here or elsewhere (including me of course) really does.

I'd agree, in a sense.

Where we differ, though, is that I see some questions as not being answerable because the particular questions are prompts for a change of context; those questions are often based on assumptions that we'd want to challenge in order to progress.

Nobody can give us a fundamental "how it works" type response, describing a process or mechanism, for example, because the very idea of a process or mechanism is one of the things under examination - the idea of division, one object operating on another, causing something by overlap in location or time, and so on.

So we end up with responses that seem to be trying to sidestep the whole thing, because they are trying essentially trying to undercut the assumptions. That, or the responses are of the sort that indicate one simply "does" it - e.g. there is no "method" to producing a mental image, one simply does so, and if one "attempts" to produce one, one produces the experience of "attempting" rather than "picturing", and so on.

Better, I think, is to try to draw attention to the properties of direct experience (which I tend to thing provides that new context which changes how we approach things), to work on clarifying the meaning of terms, and the "personal exploration" factor which is involved.

For example, Paul Linden's little summary of intention is quite good:

> [We can begin by trying an exercise which focuses on the difference between movement and the will to move (or, to say it another way, the difference between the physical body and its programming for action). Stand up with your eyes shut and imagine that you have come up to an elevator. You have a large package in your arms that you cannot put down so you can't push the elevator button with your finger. Imagine the elevator button floating in the air an inch or two to the side of one shoulder, and imagine that you have to lean over sideways and push the elevator button with your shoulder. Actually intend to push the button.
>
> Create a real desire to push the button and intend to do so. This does not mean voluntarily moving to lean over and push the button, nor does it mean becoming stiff to prevent any movement so as to keep the exercise purely “mental”. It also does not mean merely thinking about pushing the button since “thinking about” is a symbolic process which implies a separation between the thinker and the subject about which s/he thinks. In the same way, it does not mean going into a dissociated daze and picturing yourself pushing the button. It simply

> means to relax, be natural and create an authentic feeling in the mindbody of desire and intention to push the button. (Most people can create this feeling when they focus on it, though many need some guidance to home in on it.) Once you establish this feeling, you will feel yourself "involuntarily" tipping toward the imaginary button.
>
> *-- Being in Movement: Intention as Somatic Meditation*]

The later case study is an example of the exploratory process which one goes through for changing movement patterns, but applies equally to the "patterning" of experience more generally, beginning:

> [*Case Study:* As I learned how to use this approach to movement on myself, I also began to use it in my teaching and teach it as a way of moving. The final section of this article describes one example of the application of the intentional approach in teaching.]

Now, I get that this might *seem* to be unhelpful in terms of "answers", but if the answers are non-conceptual, perhaps, or otherwise cannot be communicated, or if they involve a reframing rather than an extension of our current ideas, then "communication by shared events" (exercises) is one way forward.

So that's where I'm coming from, and if other people who've tried that are "I used to be where you are", they just mean they've explored that side of things and are thinking differently about things as a result - but, of course, not necessarily *correctly*, eh? **Only you can decide!**

Reply to “Tried the glass exercise, feeling...giddy.”

I think drinking the water is okay, if people make the decision to do so, and it is perceived as somehow integrating the situation into yourself, and it feels satisfying. But the actual change occurs during the pouring and settling.

> [Q: I actually tried this experiment recently (a week and a half ago) and did drink the water after I was finished. In my opinion, the water symbolizes consciousness (which I am), so drinking it just seemed natural and carried a sense of completion. That, and it seems wrong to waste water. Anyway, I did in fact notice results in a surprising way this past Thursday. I didn't really know what to make of it, and later remembered about doing the exercise. It was really quite an interesting feeling.]

Yes, I agree with the sense of completion. In the original post, I don't actually say what to do with the water; it might be an idea for me to explicitly include it, since it is a "gap" in the instructions. In the spirit of inspiring others, what situation/result did you get? Keeping it vague to avoid privacy issues of course.

(That's the problem with this one: naturally, even doing the exercise takes a bit of courage, plus it's often a personal issue that is being addressed, so understandably people don't necessarily want to publicise it, and what it means in terms of its larger implications.)

Being Christian and all, you can be perfectly comfortable: this sort of thing is exactly where that whole religion probably began. It was a description of the way things truly operate, for the everyday man, in the form of (at the time) easily accessible metaphors. Neville Goddard's approach is entirely based upon such a reading of the Bible, for instance.

"Magick" is just a name for how things work anyway - i.e. the fact that any act performed with intention brings about results, regardless of proximity. Whether you raise your arm with a thought, or walk to the store to buy apples, or pour some water to mend a relationship, the same principle applies. The act does nothing, it's the meaning you've implicitly assigned to it which is the cause and simultaneously creates the effect. The entire world shifts towards the outcome. The apple-filled grocery store moves in your direction, not the other way around.

It takes a bit of courage, because it works against our everyday cultural assumption about how things work. It also, if we pursue it, involves revising our notions about what we are, and what the world is, and so on.

> > Magic takes the path of least resistance, just like electricity.

There's definitely something to that - particularly for this demonstration exercise - but later I think it's important to realise that what defines "least resistance" isn't something external, it's your own patterning, and that patterning is not very 'solid'.

> > I think it mainly explains why things usually look like a coincidence. That is something our minds can easily work with.

It's inherent to the approach, as I see it - which is basically "dumb" pattern-activation via intention, backed by your own intelligence.

You are triggering an increase in the contribution of a particular pattern, such that it is overlaid upon subsequent experience. It then appears to "shine through" when an appropriate opening arises, entangled into the larger context. Hence the outcomes seem "plausible if rather unlikely". If you don't deliberately *force* this pattern, then it's just incorporated into the path that's currently defined, and will appear in non-rule-breaking ways. If you are willing to take on a more direct metaphor - a more flexible description of the nature of experience - then things can become a bit more efficient.

Really, the ultimate level of "coincidence" we're after here is: the coincidence of "just deciding" something, and that something "arising" in your perceptual space, with the minimum apparent number of "moments" between the two. However, the closer those two states become, the greater the sacrifice in terms of the coherence of your world.

> It felt very wrong to pour out the water to me, I felt that drinking it was the final step, sort of internalising the result. I have had good results with this.

I've actually updated the instructions to include this - the original post just doesn't mention it - because a few people have asked what to do with the water. If one is self-conscious about it, their attention is on it, then drinking it is better than pouring it, and it can correspond to a "fixing" of the outcome. Anyway, it's pleasing that everyone's reporting getting good results.

> I'm going to try it again, this time focusing on a specific area. The first time, I picked words for my overall situation, and I have noticed changes. Just out of curiosity, is it ok to repeat the experiment with the same words?

It's what you know those words to represent, at the time you perform the exercise, that's important. It's probably nice to keep things fresh every time though, but that's a personal choice.

> I thought very carefully about them the first time, so what they represented was very clear in my mind, even though I didn't know what shape the results would take. I wanted to give the universe a lot of scope.

That would seem to be a good approach. Don't be afraid to be reasonably precise if the situation demands it - but I guess no more than is required , because the less leeway you give, perhaps more dramatic the shift, with collateral movements.

Reply to “My Method (Two Glasses)”

Although, if the underlying purpose is to get to the heart of things rather than necessarily to "get results" *as such*: how much of this is effectively "sensory theatre", derived from unexamined assumptions and concepts?

> >Good point, but maybe that sensory theatre helps people like me get results.

Maybe. But is it the sensory theatre that makes the difference? Is sensory theatre *causal*? Or is sensory theatre *itself* a result? And if so, what is it that causes change? It's worth considering this, otherwise we might be in danger of descending into a sort of superstitious behaviour, due to not realising the "meta" aspect to it all (something that I think ideas like "the law of attraction" can and has fallen into).

Unfortunate Cats & Causality

> > I guess it's like the age-old saying, "there are more ways than one to skin a cat."

Or, it could be that there is *one* way to skin a cat (or indeed, to produce any change in experience), but there are many different stances one could adopt while doing so, some which might feel more comfortable than others. Still, it will always be the act of "movement" that will skin the cat, not the particular stance - and in fact the stance is *also* an act of "movement". (Not a great analogy, that, but you get the idea.)

And so we ask: well, what is this "movement" in the more general sense, for this topic? There's no real way to say it because it is "before" concepts (the thinking of concepts is *itself* an outcome of "movement"), but we could call it "intending" or "shifting state" or "becoming a fact" or something like that.

Imagining-That

In the *Imagination Room* metaphor we introduce the idea of *imagining-that*. This awkward phrasing is to suggest the concept of "imagining the fact of something being true", with any sensory experience being an *aspect* of that fact-pattern. This, in turn, leads to imagining the fact of properties - see, for example, the blue sphere example:

> So, first imagine a sphere in front of you - say, a blue sphere with no particular detail, just floating there. Okay, now imagine a sphere in front of you, identical in every way to the first, except also imagine that this sphere is imbued with the special power to make the room filled with joy. *But do not change the sensory aspect of the sphere in any way when you do this.*

This is basically "imagining the fact of something being true" abstractly. That is, that an object, or your ongoing experience more generally, has a property, without actually visualising any sensory aspects to that property. Instead of doing all the "sensory theatre" of picturing stuff, in an effort to associatively trigger the fact or as an excuse to do so, you can just *directly* do intending-asserting of the fact into greater prominence.

Finally, after taking a pause to clear yourself out a little, instead of using the sphere image, simply *directly intend* that the room is filled with joy, and experience the result of that. That is, wordlessly intend the fact of: "it is true now that this room is filled with joy". And, um, *enjoy*.

And so this *imagining-that* is another way of talking about this, which highlights that the content of sensory theatre is not causal. But then, how so this, we might ask:

Why Did It (Or Did It Even) Help?

> until I started reading other's experiences and putting what works for them together that I came up with this and it's worked insanely well thus far.

This brings to mind when people first hear about the idea of lucid dreaming, and spend lots of time immersing themselves in books, articles, and personal accounts of lucid dreaming, pondering the nature of lucid dreaming and imagining what it would be like. The result: they "spontaneously" have a lucid dream, even though they didn't "do" anything to get one. Subsequently, they focus on *trying* to have lucid dreams using techniques, and they struggle.

I suggest this is due to *immersion and commitment*, the shaping of themselves according to those ideas - basically, they have *patterned themselves* (in the sense of *you-as-awareness* rather than as a person) and the content of their ongoing experience subsequently is (because it is inseparable from it) from that new state or formatting. So you were "reading other's experiences" and accepting what they say worked and dedicating yourself, in a committed way, to coming up with something that worked. But it isn't the technique that works, that has made the difference - it's the fact that you focused upon, and assumed with full commitment either directly or via implication, a particular patterning. This is why it "worked insanely well" for you - and why although others might get a brief boost from something fresh, they probably won't get the same outstanding outcome.

There *is* something more to be said, though:

Two Glasses & Patterning

The original instructions for the *Two Glasses Exercise*, which are stripped down to the minimum required for a reason which should be clear, leverage an existing abstract pattern which is fairly universally shared, while also minimising the possibility of undoing the shift that is produced. Actually, it's really two patterns: that of shifting amount-intensity-location (modifying the relative contribution or existence of a quantity), and that of association-overlap-identification (creating a handle onto pre-existing states or patterns).

This is the "cheat" involved. However, having gotten results - which is greatly existed by, as the instructions suggest, following the instructions *as written* and then carrying on with your life without over-thinking it or putting effort into it - and then having experimented with different and increasingly unlikely outcomes which obviously cannot possibly be related to a *literal* pouring of water or labels, the more general notion and prevalence of patterning becomes apparent. (Particularly when considered alongside the *Owls of Eternity* exercise, the metaphors linked in the sidebar, and the notion of "active metaphors" more broadly.)

> I'm interested in your reply to this - do you use the original verbatim or have you tweaked it?

From the above, you get the idea: the method doesn't really matter, although it *is* a hook into and a platform from which to explore the nature of experience (which was the original idea of it: it shows "something's up!", and prompts: "what is the nature of this?"), after which you could experiment more directly.

> what is your opinion on the effectiveness of your emotional state in regards to all this? Would you say your emotions towards manifesting something you desire is irrelevant under the context of you-as-awareness? Is the connection between the two merely a perceived pattern?

Ah, by that I meant that we are not completely void emptiness before we do this stuff - we have patterns of all sorts, from the fact of the senses, to that of length and change, and ever more abstract ones (which can't really be conceptualised). Basically, the world that we are "makes sense", and that is because it *is* a set of patterns, as selected from the background of all possible patterns. And the two glasses exercise operates by, instead of having you having to intend an desired fact-pattern (outcome) from nowhere, piggy-backing on a couple of already-active ones. Specifically, the meaningfulness of "amount" and "location", and the explicit or implied assignment of meaning (the labeled-glass water levels are implied to mean the "intensity" of the current and target situations, become "handles" onto them).

This not something you have to "do" as an act, I hasten to add, it comes for free with the "dumb patterning system" that you are - and in fact "trying" to do it tends to get in the way, since inevitably you use effort or bring to mind other patterns (and what is effort? usually just the production of a feeling of muscular tension, which has it's own associated extended pattern).

As for emotional states - I'd say that emotional content is just like any other content, a sight or a sound or a smell. It is tempting to treat it as special because it can't be articulated well, seems all-encompassing because it is not so clearly located as other sensory stuff. However, I'd treat it as part of a moment. For sure, by associative triggering, deliberately holding a particular emotional state is like selecting out patterns associated with that state versus others, but I don't think it's a great approach overall.

It's a bit like, again, going back to visualising something ("a blue ball") without the intention ("picturing this blue ball *means-that* my exam will work out great"). The intention - the explicit or implied statement of something being true - is the actual pattern that you are seeking to make more dominant, everything else is sensory theatre and non-causal (which you are, ironically, triggering by intention as well: "it is true now that I am perceiving this image").

Of course, it's difficult to make broad pronouncements here beyond the basics, because we're all dealing with different initial patterning, different extended patterns associated with things like (for example) "a blue ball" or "the feeling of being melancholy" or whatever.

Hence, the encouragement to experiment and explore, because there is no method or mechanism as such - for they, too, are patterns, with nothing solid and permanent underlying them. ("Active metaphors" being the concept of coming up with "formatting" which you then adopt to pattern a "how things work", rather than just a "what's going to happen".)

Reply to “How my mother used the Just Decide Technique and got the result she wanted in 20 days.”

Yeah, it's fun eh? The more you do this stuff, the more you'll find that "other people" are telling you how they are doing it too...

It's not solipsism *or* co-creation though. Solipsism implies that you are the only person. But really you are not even a person. Co-creation implies that there are multiple contributors to your perspective, but this is not the case. Actually, you are the whole world (or at least: a version of the whole world is in you-as-consciousness) but are looking out from one apparent perspective. The "other people" *and* "you-as-person" are aspects of this world, parts of its continuous pattern, all arising within your consciousness.

But what about multiplicity? Multiple conscious beings having their own experiences? Is there no overlap?

We tend to think that the world is shared in a simple way: like a spatial environment that is unfolding in time, such that we are all seeing the same place at the same time. But it's more like every being is a conscious space, selecting into themselves the patterns they like from a "toy box" which contains all the possible experiences of *being-a-person-in-a-world*. That way, every being can be having a different experience *and* be overlapping, albeit indirectly.

(In truth, when you follow this to the end, consciousness is indistinguishable so there's only *one* consciousness, with a multiplicity of experiences which cannot be described because it is "before" time and space. Unfortunately though, because our thinking is of a 'shadow-sensory' form, we end up having to use spatial and temporal metaphors to talk about it.)

Anyway, the final result is still that: you have control over your own "private copy" because you choose, explicitly or implicitly, what set of patterns you have triggered into brightness, what *facts-of-the-world* you are allowing to contribution to your ongoing experience.

[...]

Parts and Relations

The truth is there is no way to talk about this in language. Immediately when we try to talk or think about this, we have to invoke a spatial metaphor, because to think of something we have to have a concept consisting of parts, and arrange those parts relative to one another. But consciousness doesn't have parts - or spatial extent or temporal relationship - those are aspects of *an experience*. So as soon as we conceptualise this situation, we're wrong. Because the thinking of it is a structured experience, and this is "before" experience.

It is evident from direct introspection that consciousness has no properties of itself; there can be no "two" consciousness(es). We can come up with a label "consciousness" and *imagine that* there are parts which are related to one another, but they are not. That's just a diagram in our mind. No matter how we approach this, it's incorrect. Conscious spaces do not exist *in* anything since there is no outside, because it is "before" division; and there is only one or actually not *even*, because it is "before" multiplicity.

Again: it is literally not possible to think about this. It cannot be represented, because it is that which takes on the shape of experiences, and representations are just more experiences.

However, we can use a metaphor which at least breaks some of the usual assumptions, and so...

Sharing without Space and Time

In an attempt to avoid using time and space as the framework in which we relate perspectives, I use this picture:

- The world is not a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time". We are not people sharing an environment.
- We are "that which has experiences", basically conscious spaces which *take on the shape of* the experience we are having.
- There is no temporal or spatial relationship between conscious spaces.
- Instead, the world can be thought of as a collection of all possible patterns. It is more like a *shared resource* than a place.
- So the sense in which we "overlap" is in the format of the experiences we have; the shared subset of patterns.
- This means that our ongoing experience is more like the associative traversal of a memory block. It's a strand of thought *about* being a person in a world - rather than actually *being* a person in a world.

When you tie this up with the fact there is only one consciousness, that the conscious space you are right now is the only one there is, that the has no boundaries and there is nothing else, you realise there is no outside of this. However, although there is no "outside", there can be a very detailed "inside". The relationship we *can* potentially talk about is shared patterns, even though we cannot talk about relations in a time or space context.

Right now you are "God" of this copy of the world - and so is everyone else of their copies - and they don't clash! So this is not solipsism because *it is not personal* and "everyone else" is in the same situation (or one consciousness is in lots of situations, whatever).

Why Bother?

Why bother with all this? If it wasn't required we wouldn't bother, and most people can just ignore it. But...

If you experiment a little, the fact is that **your world does not behave like a co-created place**. You can wake up tomorrow and everything has shifted, including people you know, and it will "always have been that way". Facts can completely change and "always have been that way". Your world actually behaves as if it is one continuous pattern - *your pattern, dissolved in consciousness* - which includes the apparent properties of "you-as-person" and "other people", a pattern that **responds to your intention in an unrestricted manner**. So this gives us a way to conceptualise that, while avoiding misleading metaphors. It's not like "private views" are a new idea of course - QBism, as a recent example, uses it to describe the subjectivity of quantum physics. The tricky step is realising that there is no objective world - no CPU - that links or synchronises the subjective worlds, and that in effect there is just one subjective experiencer.

TL;DR: Solipsism is actually meaningless in this context. The world is best thought of as a resource, rather than a place.

[...]

> Is it possible for there to be a concept such as 1+1=2, that exists before experience?

They exist purely within experience. You can use such abstractions to create a narrative *about* experience (within experience), but it is meaningless to say they exist "before" experience. (I use "before" in quotes because, of course, there is no such thing.)

What I mean by within experience - It's tempting to think of the bright 3D-immersive sensory element (a "scene") in experience to be "the world" and somehow everything else is behind the scenes - but there *is* no behind the scenes. It's all present but dissolved, being experienced now. Metaphor: like the sun in the daytime sky, where the stars are still there but obscured; it's a matter of relative brightness. Layers of patterns, some of which are shining through into prominence.

So we do end up with a situation where our experience is "formatted" and structured, depending on what level of prominance certain patterns have, and hence our narratives within experience will also be so-formatted. (The senses, objects separation, spatial extent, all *arise-with* particular scenes, for instance.) And at the limit, we might imagine that the format of narrative approaches the more simple patterns of experience. But that again is part of experience and it is only "about" partitioned experiencing; the narrative cannot accurately describe the formatting.

Meanwhile, things like the global background *felt-sense*, which could be said to be the direct experience of the current state, can't be given that narrative. And of course "unformatted consciousness" itself - which was what we were focusing on before - cannot be conceptualised at all. You can only *be* it.

To summarise -

- Mathematical *concepts* are within experience (being thoughts, this is so by definition), and any "formatting" to which it refers is part of experience too.
- It's the "sandbox" problem. You can make shapes in the sand which represent other shapes in the sand, but you cannot make a shape which represents *sand* or *the sandbox itself*.

I like this N. David Mermin article on reification of abstractions, although it's a bit physicsy for some. It's good at marking out the difference between (direct) experience and narrative, in the context of creating and using theories.

[...]

It's true you don't need to enter a state of mind - *any* declaration of fact, explicit or implicit, has effect - but the more 'surrendered' you are, the more completely things can shift, and the more efficiently the result can appear. Which is why metaphors are useful; they provide "plausible paths" for things to arise that are beyond the norm. But yes, it's *super-simple*. Unfortunately it inherently doesn't "make sense" though (it's "before" conceptual frameworks), so people generally need some sort of outlook to hang it on. So long as you choose a very flexible and abstract one, it's okay.

> The dimensional jumping idea in itself is extremely interesting because it breaks you out of causality even more, since things that already are can become different.

Yes, you've totally nailed this - that's exactly the point of it.

Pretty much every other methodology makes the assumption that what I call *Observation Accumulation* is irreversible. In other words, that new observations must always be consistent with prior observations - so that the world always “makes sense”. That you can only shift parts of the world-pattern that you haven't "seen" yet, because the parts you have seen are now "defined".

However, this is an overstatement of the *Law of Coherence* - which in fact only states that the world-pattern must be self-consistent *at any particular moment* (which follows because it is a single continuous pattern). It *doesn’t* say that the next *moment-state* necessarily needs to be consistent with all previous *moment-states*. So: the world-pattern can shift as a whole and coherence is still fufilled.

Dimensional jumping and its metaphors say that there are no external laws enforcing the persistence of prior observations; the basic version of the Law of Coherence is the only law that applies. Established facts don't change because... you don't allow them to or you don't even make the attempt.

Anyway, this means that we can *assert* things in order to:

- Effectively “re-observe” prior observations and correct the associated “facts”.
- Create new "fake" observations and have them count as “facts”.

And the world-pattern will shift coherently, meaning that all subsequent observations will be consistent with its new state. The main problem for people is that committing to this involves throwing away (or better: just not thinking about) their usual way of conceiving of the world: it is no longer a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time" that we all share; it's a "shared resource" of possible patterns that we individually select and trigger into our conscious perspectives, as a "private view".

[...]

> Can someone explain this method?

It's what's underneath everything: declaring that something is a fact, and the world unfolds "as if" that were true. (Taking the mother's perspective:) In this case, his mother - believing in a "soul" - sends it out to do her work for her. Implicitly, she has decided that *performing that act means-that her situation will be resolved*. Her world shifts accordingly.

This works in the same way as the *Two Glasses Exercise* works by implicitly deciding (asserting) that transferring the water shifts the state. By making that decision, you are *literally* connecting the situation to the water, and by pouring it you are *literally* updating your world.

I imagine she just said, "soul, go out and sort things out for me!". Subsequently, she had an experience "as if" such a thing existed, and that it sorted things out.

Reply to “What does this sub think of DMT?”

> >I think it relies on the theory that consciousness is the fundamental stuff of nature.

I think we perhaps have to delve a little deeper than that, to make the necessary connections. We need to make a distinction between a "view from nowhere" description of the world (a fictional 3rd-person picture), versus one which links to direct experience. So: It is not so much that "consciousness is the fundamental of nature", in the sense of it being a material from which three-dimensional worlds are made. Rather, it is more that there is consciousness (or "awareness") and that this consciousness "takes on the shape of" states of experience. A state of experience being a full definition of all contribution facts and patterns to ongoing experience, all implied moments, *now*. A "dimensional jump" is really a change of *state*, not a move to another *place*, and you are not an *object*, although you might take on experiences "as if" you were. So, "brains" don't do anything, because there is no such object really; and things are not made up from vibrations, frequencies and interactions. We might have experiences which are *consistent with descriptions constructed from* those concepts, but the experiences themselves are simply "consciousness". (And in fact, descriptions are themselves just experiences: the experience of "thinking about experience".)

From a previous comment in response to a post about astral projection, magick and the subconscious:

[We might say that the] only fundamental, permanent truth is the fact of *being-aware* - or "awareness" - with everything else temporary patterning on an "as if" basis. Rather than a person with a subconscious who is sending out requests into the world, you are more like a "non-material material whose only inherent property is *being-aware* or 'awareness', and which 'takes on the shape of' states of experience, states imply and define all subsequent sensory moments". Right now, for example, you have "taken on the shape of" apparently (on an "as if" basis) *being-a-person-in-a-world*.

Meanwhile, this means that any so-called "magick" is, despite any theatrics that go along with it, a *self-shaping* of oneself into a new experiential state. All apparent entities or techniques or other causes that are experienced are just aspects of that state: moments as "results".

A DMT experience, then, is simply another experience. The reason it seems noteworthy isn't to do with the experience itself as such, more that it clashes with the assumptions and properties of our usual description of "the world". That is, that we are a *person-object* located within a *world-place*, where "the world" is "stable, simply-shared, spatially-extended place unfolding in time". This, however, is *never* true; it's just that we are rarely drawn to notice the inadequacy of that formulation, or are dismissive of experiences that don't fit into it (because we treat the description as primary, and our experiences as secondary, even though the description is itself a sort of experience at the same level, as noted above).

None of this is intended to be dismissive of the DMT experience. It's simply to highlight that its value (other than enjoyment) is to draw attention to our flawed assumptions about *everyday experience*, rather than because it is, say, some sort of "higher consciousness" *special experience*. (It is not: consciousness doesn't have "levels".) The same can also be said of "void" experiences, "enlightenment" experiences, and the like.

> > Off-topic but, what do you think about non-duality*? *let's say Advaita Zen and the like

So I'd say that most things, in some way, point to the same insight, even though the descriptions then tend to get mangled later. That is, everything is patterns of *you-as-awareness*, and although you might have an

experience *of* division ("as if" there were division), experience *itself* is not divided. And "non-duality" is perhaps a better pointer than most, being somewhat more modern with less cultural baggage than some.

However, it sometimes seems that some strands tend to get bogged down in language contortions, particularly the "neo" stuff, in an attempt to avoid saying anything wrong. Personally, I think that embracing things like metaphor as a *part of* and *shaping of* experience, doing so knowingly, is a better approach than avoiding it. That is, as part of our investigation into the "nature of experiencing", to *also* tackle explicitly and head on the nature of *descriptions*. That frees us up, I think; it makes it more experimental and playful.

Ultimately, it's the case that there is no description or method or technique or even a "how it works", so it is in *some* ways pointless to feel around for the best approach, or compare approaches. I kind of like to think that the angle this subreddit takes admits this from the outset - and benefits from that by taking an explicit "meta" view on experiences and descriptions, so that no one experience or description is taken to be "it" (but rather, experiences *within and as* it). But of course that, although perhaps not initially, easily becomes the very problem it is trying to avoid, if it is accepted unquestioningly.

Reply to “My perspective on dimensional jumping (Introduction to creating reality with your thoughts)”

EDIT: The point of this comment was to try and explore in more detail what, exactly, the concept of "thoughts create reality" means, from a particular perspective on the nature of "you", "thought" and "reality". However, it's a bit muddled in the execution, oh well.

It might be worth explicitly distinguishing between *passing* thought and *deliberate, intentional* thought. This potentially allows us to clarify that it's not the thought *as such* that does anything; thoughts could be viewed as simply pseudo-sensory aspects of your current "state", really. (Where a "state" is the current set of fact-patterns contributing to, and fully defined the future moments of, your ongoing experience.)

Rather, it's the *intentional content* - or the "direct meaning" - that makes the difference.

Here, by "an intention" we mean the fact or pattern that we seek to increase the relative contribution of, and by "intending" we mean the increasing of that contribution (whereby shifting the "shape" of one's state, of oneself). There is no *act* involved in this, though - there's no mechanism or technique. One simply *intends*.

Meanwhile, the sensory thought aspect is *itself* a result of intention, not a cause; it's a bit of theatre. Now, for sure, you can get synchronicity arising if you visualise something - a bit like having deformed a surface and the contours being overlaid upon experience from then on, or drawing upon a television screen and the pattern "shining through" the gaps to be incorporated in every image to some extent (see: the owls exercise, for example). However, a *fact* is itself an experience of "meaning" - it has no spatial or temporal component itself. It is unbounded and sort of "dissolved" into the background of your experience, with only its sensory aspects arising occasionally. So when you want to intend a fact, just conjuring an image or saying a phrase isn't necessarily what you want to do. Certainly, it may trigger the fact-pattern by association, but really what you want to do is intend the fact-pattern *directly*. This can't be described in words, but you "know" when you are doing it. You do it whenever you shift yourself in mundane ways. (Ponder: do you conjure an image when you change your destination when walking along the street? No, you *feel-know-intend* the change, directly.)

There is not a "you" and "the world"; there is just *you-as-awareness* which has "taken on the shape of" the experience of *being-a-person-in-a-world*. Whereas the construction of language forces us to talk of a "doer" and an "act" and a "thing done to", in our actual experience this is not the case. Attempts to enact "doing" tend to complicate things or lead to failure, because we assume a separate mechanism that we are trying to harness. In fact, there is no mechanism: we *shape-shift* our experience, our state, via *intention*, which is self-caused change.

All of this suggests a very fundamental reason why we can encounter difficulties:

- *Intention is literal and direct.*

Thinking doesn't *create* your reality, your state. A thought actually *is* a pattern within your state. A passing thought is a view of your current state; a deliberate thought is the intensification of that pattern in your state.

It's almost claustrophobic to think about: there is no separation between you and your state, you and your thought, you and your sensory experience, you and your intention. There is no gap between thinking, intending and experiencing.

The point of this, is that the thought "I am happy" literally *is* the fact-pattern of "I am happy", and increasing its relative "intensity" of via intention will increase its contribution to your ongoing experience. However, to be clear, it's not the *words* "I am happy" that you want to intend - that is a mistake easily made (leading to all sorts of synchronicity *about* happiness or the phrase "I am happy"). Those words are part of the extended pattern of *being-happy* and can be used to trigger it to an extent, perhaps. However, it's really the fact-pattern of which those words are a sensory aspect that you want to intend.

This literal nature means that you need to be aware of what, *exactly*, you are intending, because the mechanism here (if it can really be called a mechanism) is that of a "dumb patterning system", a direct deformation of your present state. There is no intelligence between you and intention and the change of state. If you conjure up "this visual image", then that *visual image* will be more prevalent in your experience. If you conjure up "this visual image which means that fact will be true", then *that fact* will be more prevalent in your experience (and probably the visual image too).

Essentially, then, it's like you are drawing patterns directly upon awareness - sometimes in 3D, sometimes "non-dimensionally" and abstractly; sometimes sensory images, sometimes "facts" or "formatting" - thereby increasing their prominence in the unfolding world-experience from that point onwards.

> > Can you give examples highlighting the difference between "this visual image" and "this visual image which means that fact will be true". Like if I imagine myself holding 2 million dollars in cash, is that belonging to the first or the second category?

It's probably better to experiment with something more abstract.

So, first imagine a sphere in front of you - say, a blue sphere with no particular detail, just floating there. Okay, now imagine a sphere in front of you, identical in every way to the first, except also imagine that this sphere is imbued with the special power to make the room filled with joy. *But do not change the sensory aspect of the sphere in any way when you do this.* This is basically "imagining the fact of something being true" abstractly. That is, that an object, or your ongoing experience more generally, has a property, without actually visualising any sensory aspects to that property. Instead of doing all the "sensory theatre" of picturing stuff, in an effort to associatively trigger the fact or as an excuse to do so, you can just *directly* do intending-asserting of the fact into greater prominence. Finally, after taking a pause to clear yourself out a little, instead of using the sphere image, simply *directly intend* that the room is filled with joy, and experience the result of that. That is, wordlessly intend the fact of: "it is true now that this room is filled with joy". And, um, *enjoy*.

Aside - Note that there is no *effort* in doing so, and any "trying" will just distract you, amounting to an intending of the "feeling of trying" rather than the fact of "joyful room" being true.

[...]

There can be a difficulty, sometimes, with elevating emotions and treating them as if they are special rather than just another sensation-perception within an experience (albeit a difficult one to put into concepts and language). I suggest that emotions would be best understood as a *sensory aspect* of the fact, arising as an object within experience.

Meanwhile, the *fact itself* is sort of "unbounded" or "timeless and spaceless". It is not experienced as an object, instead it's sort of just "known". You might call it a sense of "meaning".

So, while "imagining (intending, asserting) the fact of something being true" might *result* in an experience of an emotion, it is not necessarily required, and the emotion is not itself a *cause*. When we say "the feeling that something is true", we aren't referring to an emotion, we're referring to a *felt-knowing*, a global sense of a particular thing being true. The problem with some approaches (many LOA descriptions included) is they miss out this "secret sauce" and therefore just produce minimal intensification of some of the patterning associated with facts, rather than direct addressing the facts themselves. This can still produce "results", of course, as synchronicity (basic "patterning") but it can be frustrating to work with, because there's no real understanding of the cause ("intending").

Unfortunately, this activity of "intending" can't be described at all, really, only pointed at. Intending has no mechanism or method, and is before "things" so is non-conceptual. And so we hit the difficulty whereby people end up focussed on what *can* be talked about and thought about (basically: objects within experience, which are results) and miss out (when writing) or don't realise (when reading) that there is a specific actual cause of all change (which is not any one of those experiential objects). We then can end up with a "cargo cult" version of the topic:

> [The term "cargo cult" has been used metaphorically to describe an attempt to recreate successful outcomes by replicating circumstances associated with those outcomes, although those circumstances are either unrelated to the causes of outcomes or insufficient to produce them by themselves. In the former case, this is an instance of the post hoc ergo propter hoc fallacy.]

That is, people try to generate the results by just intensifying part of the pattern associated with the target fact, perhaps getting some outcome by association, but not really going for their target directly. The distinction between doing the owl exercise (increasing the intensity of contribution of the "owl" extended pattern) and actually intending a specific outcome ("it is true *now* that *[this fact about owls]*"), basically. Or between imagining some objects (the blue sphere for example), as opposed to: imagining some objects while asserting-intending-knowing it *means-that* something is true or will happen.

[...]

> > In this context, isn't the cause (to create) and deliberate intending the same thing?

This is why all of this ultimately leads to an exploration of the "nature of experiencing" - that is, examining what "you" are, exactly, and what your actual relationship is to "the world".

Intending, then, is like "shape-shifting". You might say you are shifting your *state*, where by "state" we mean the set of relative contributions (or "intensity") of all possible facts or patterns, which means to shift yourself. There is no "you" and the "state" or "world" - instead, you sort of "take on the shape of" a particular situation or experience (in the broadest sense, not just the current sensory moment). Right now, you have "taken on the shape of" the experience of apparently ("as if") *being-this-person-in-this-world*. So there is, as you say, no difference between causing and intending. We might define "an intention" as the fact or pattern we wish to increase the contribution of, and "intending" as the intensifying of that pattern - shifting to a state where that fact-pattern is more prominent.

Although we often use the word "create" for this sort of thing, actually that's strictly speaking not ideal. The implication of the above is that *all patterns exist, eternally*. Patterns are "before" time (with time, or change, being an *aspect of experience*, a pattern like any other, rather than something fundamental). They cannot be

created or destroyed; they just *are*. This means that every experience, at least implicitly, is always available, and that we simply "shift our posture" such that some are more prominent than the rest.

Now, returning to what "you" are, if you discount anything which changes in your ongoing experience (how can something be ultimately true, if it can shift?), the only permanent thing turns out to be the property of *being-aware*. Or at least, it is meaningless to talk of the absence of that. All other facts or patterns can be more or less "true", but not that.

Putting it all together, then: We might say that what you truly are is "awareness" which is "taking on the shape of" states of experience. Between shifts, the sequence of moments you experience is fully determined by the facts within that state. The apparent change of sensory content moment to moment is actually static also in this description: "time passing" is just another pattern, albeit a more abstract formatting than most. The *only* true change that ever occurs - and hence the *only* cause of apparent change in ongoing sensory experience - is when we "intend", which is just word used to point to the act of us shifting ourselves to a different set of prominent facts.

[...]

I suspect we are probably talking at cross purposes a little, since we are using some words in different ways, and some underlying assumptions are perhaps different. The word "thought" is a problematic one anyway, I guess; it's too vague!

So, in your description, where (and what) are "you"? And where would "another consciousness" be, relative to that?

> This is why I am having a hard time separating intention from other thoughts.

In *type* or *nature* they are identical, of course. However, there is a distinction to made made between thoughts which simply arise spontaneously, and those which arise from deliberate intention. In the first case, it's just a passing thought appearing in accordance with your current state (more later), in the latter you are *reshaping* your state by way of deliberate thinking.

There is no difference in sensory experience between the two. And in fact, there may be *no* sensory aspect to intending if there's no result component which overlaps with the current moment (although one "knows" one is intending.) The "how" cannot be described, because it is like "shape-shifting". But there is a difference in that one is an aspect of "how things are" and one is "changing how things are".

So, pondering - "Intention", then, is simply a term used when referring to a "pattern" that one is increasing the contribution of ("intending"), which is done simply by "thinking it" or 'imagining it" or more accurately: "experiencing it" or "asserting as an experience". The fight with language here is because we want to avoid implying that there is a "thinker" who then "thinks the thought", with one being "over here" and another "over there" in any sense. Really, one "takes on the shape of" the fact, pattern, or experience. This last point is key.

Loosely, the outline of this description would be:

- The only *fundamental* fact is the property of *being-aware* - or "awareness".
- All other facts are *relatively* true only; they are temporary. They can be conceived of as "patterns" in awareness.

- All possible fact-patterns exist eternally, "dissolved" into the background. Your state is the current distribution of relative intensities of those facts.
- What you truly are, is "awareness", and this is always true, regardless of what "shape" you have taken on.
- Currently, then, *you-as-awareness* have "taken on the shape" of a particular state. This state consists of all the facts or patterns currently contributing to your ongoing experience. It fully defines your experience - as in, all subsequent moments are fully determined, between shifts of state.
- To alter your experience, you shift your state by changing the relative intensity of a particular fact or pattern. You do this simply by "intending" - that is, a sort of "thinking" but not a thinking *about*, rather a thinking *as*. Still better described as a "taking on the shape of" or "becoming of" a situation.
- Intending cannot be described (because it is "before" concepts) and is non-experiential (has no inherent sensory aspect), although sensory aspects may arise from doing it if the change in state involves an impact in the current "moment". However these are *results* of intending, not *causes* of outcomes.
- There is no "outside" to experience, and awareness is "before" division and multiplicity. The only thing that is "happening", is this exact experience, right now. And thoughts you have *about* an "outside" to experience, are also experiences (that is, the experience of thinking about experience) and are "inside".

And so on.

As the last point suggests, though, there's not all *that* much point in thinking about this relentlessly, because ultimately thinking is just another experience (although by doing so deliberately you are to an extent "patterning" yourself for future experiences: so we might choose our models carefully if we are going to focus on them a lot). Simple experiments and exercises show the way more clearly, once we have put "descriptions" in their proper place. For example, the *Feeling Out* exercise is useful for bringing us back to our actual situation, rather than an idea *about* it.

Reply to “Altering your reality questions/thoughts”

> For instance when I jump I take into account how my intended reality has imprinted on all possible observers.

So, to be clear maybe: Are you suggesting that you *having the idea of* there being other observers might make it difficult, because we conceive of some things as being "shared facts" rather than "personal facts", and imagine that this makes them harder to change? Or are you suggesting that there *actually are other observers* whose participation in the world makes it difficult? The supporting question to ponder would be: Have you ever witnessed anything that wasn't your own observation, including the experience of seeing *apparent* other observers? Do we have any evidence that having the experience of perceiving "other people" can limit us in other aspects of our experience?

It's quite a common thing, the idea that we are in a consensual reality, a "shared place" where we all contribute to the overall set of facts. Can we be sure, though, that this isn't just something that our experience behaves "as if" it is true, because it's an idea we hold on to firmly (perhaps worried that the alternative is to let go of the notion of "other people" altogether)?

(Note: I'm answering this without having read the other replies - and I'm taking a slightly different angle than I might usually, to offer an alternative approach, which might seem a little oblique at first. Let's see where it leads. Added headings to make it clearer. Ran out of time for proof-reading, so apologies in advance.)

Other People Problem

> The hardest thing I've come to terms with 'shifting reality' is how do the other people fit in?

It pretty much is the hardest thing, I think, but perhaps not for the reasons you suggest. Your language still, in effect, assumes the world to be a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time" as your starting point. The best starting point is probably to recognise the nature of our direct experience. *That* is what it is fundamentally true. Loosely, you are "that which is aware and takes on the shape of states and experiences". However, by experiences we mean "sensations, perceptions and thoughts", we don't mean that there is a world all laid out in space going on and on; rather, the world is more "dimensionlessly dissolved within you". So, that is what is *fundamentally* true. What you truly are, cannot be described in words, because it is "before" division and change and other formatting structures, but it is "aware" and it is what *becomes* other things. For convenience, we might described it as an "open aware space" which has no boundary. Now, we move onto what we're currently engaged in: trying to reach an understanding, by describing things in worlds and thoughts. But we have to realise that all our thoughts *about* the world and ourselves are *also* within that "open aware space". The world is already a structure in awareness, any thoughts we have *about* the world are parallel structures. What we are is what everything is made from, so any thoughts about that *are* it but cannot *describe* it.

The Beach

A metaphor I quite like is of making sandcastles on an infinite beach. If one sandcastle is the world, as a pre-existing sandcastle, then trying to think *about* the world is to make a *parallel* sandcastle which is superficially similar in certain respects, but is *not it*. Then, thinking about the nature of the world and self is like trying to build a sandcastle which accurately represents both "the beach" and "sand. It cannot be done!

However, ironically, the failed representation *is* both "the beach" and "sand". In this metaphor, your true nature is the beach. Now, in that model, where is the "external world"? It only exists as a constructed sandcastle. It might be a *self-consistent* sandcastle, but no matter how intricate and convincingly detailed that sandcastle is, it never represents the *actual* reality of the beach and of sand. One can only *be* beach/sand, once cannot think it nor can one observe it.

So, summarising: what we truly seem to be - by direct observation - is an "open aware unbounded space" within which experiences arise as "sensations, perceptions and thoughts". The world, then, is like a *strand of experience*, like a thought you are having, albeit a very bright, stable and 3D-immersive one. Thoughts *about* the world are parallel, and do not actually describe the world or the nature of experience. They are, in effect, separate worlds of their own.

All in the Mind

> So are you implying that essentially the world we live in is actually all in our minds and that you, in fact, do not exist in my world?

It is not *your* mind; it is simply "mind". Mind taking on the shape of a particular state or world-pattern, hence taking on the shape of an experience. This means that "you", fundamentally speaking, aren't actually a person. You are just taking on a "person-shaped experience" at this moment - you are adopting the perceptive of an *apparent* person, but that includes taking on the shape of all other *apparent* people too. A bit like selecting frames from a stack of all possible movie frames. However, this sounds a bit "dead", but actually the entire thing is *alive* with the aliveness that is you; it's just not a *personal* aliveness because it comes "before" the experience of people. That aliveness is unbounded awareness, and since that is "before" division and change, there *is only one awareness* (which right now is taking on the shape of an experience of *being-a-person-in-a-world*). "Reality" in this view is static and eternal, the only thing that shifts is awareness itself as it adopts new shapes for experiences, from the field of all possible simultaneously-existing experiences.

> But the table must physically exist, right?

What does that mean, though? What does it mean for something to be "physical"? Refer to what you are actually experiencing, rather than what you are thinking *about* the experience (because there are many different ways to do that). The table might be said to exist, but only in the sense that it is a "fact" or "pattern" that is persisting. It has no solidity other than that. (The *feeling* of solidity is just a sensation floating unmoored in awareness.)

Limited to Speculation

> ultimately we can only ever speculate and form theories and metaphors to explain this universe.

It's not even that, though. It's that the truth of the matter is that the nature of things is "before" theories and metaphors. Our metaphors are just parallel constructions. You never get to a deep understanding through thought, because thought itself is "made from" the thing you are trying to understand. Only by considering the *nature of* your thinking and experiencing, can you realise how things actually are. It's like an extra "meta-level" that comes before everything else. *Fundamental* truth with everything else just being relative, self-referencing truth.

> do you think that, including our perception, every other physical object in this universe is all in our heads?

Well, not in our "heads", because our "heads" are within our experiencing. But everything is within our awareness, sort of dissolved within it, I'd say, like a list of facts or patterns (fact-patterns). That is just a metaphor though, of course.

The Possibility of Limitations

> Do you believe that all limitations are in our *mind* when it comes to shifting reality?

There's no underlying structure supporting our experience so - yes, in effect. Although there is no solid underlying substrate to experience, there is obviously *structure* to it - it is *patterned*. So changing your experience involves shifting the relative intensities of those fact-patterns. Since those fact-patterns are made from *you-as-awareness*, the only way to do that is to shift shape - that is, to shift our state or "jump dimensions" in the main metaphor. How do we do this? The only way is *intention*. Between intentions, we are merely experiencing the unfolding of a deterministic path inherent in our current state. If we want to change it, we must change the relative intensity of (that is, "intend") a pattern (the "intention"). There is no other power.

> If I was truly devoid of any and all limitations, to the point that I was "barely human" and that I knew...

Well, your "human" aspect is part of the patterning of your current experience. You are not a human, fundamentally, but you are having a *being-a-human* experience. So long as you don't dissolve that patterning, then you will continue to have that perspective even as the world itself apparently changes. (Note also: people tend to worry that their "humanity" is what makes them good and moral, and that if they lost that they would become evil. Actually, the pattern is overlaid *on top of* awareness, and awareness is fundamentally a sort of good aliveness. Hence all the stuff about the universe being "love" and all that.)

> ...could I live in a fantasy world, the same way I am living now? It's bordering on psychosis at this point.

You already *are* living *as* a person in a fantasy world. To change to another fantasy world involves, essentially, changing the patterning of your current experience. Adopting a formatting or an active metaphor, one might conceive of this as switching from one 3D-immersive strand of thought about a world, to another one.

Summary

- Fundamentally, what you truly are is an "open awareness" whose only inherent property is *being-aware*, which has taken on the shape of a particular state and experience.
- You can directly experience this to be true. It is the only thing that is certain and *fundamentally true*.
- Your current experience is of *being-a-person-in-a-world*. Or more strictly speaking, *being-a-world-from-the-perspective-of-a-person*.
- The world is not a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time", although we might have experiences "as if" that were true. It is perhaps best described as a "world-pattern" which consists of a relative distribution of intensities of facts. These are *relatively true*.

- This "world-pattern" can be updated via intention. Only experimentation can prove this to yourself.
- The "world" overall might be better considered as a *shared resource of possible experiential patterns* rather than a *shared place*.
- There are other people, but they are part of the world-pattern. The person you are experiencing is also part of the world-pattern. The only intelligence or awareness is the one you are right now, taking on the shape of *apparently* being one of those people, but *in effect* being all of them.

[...]

I absolutely agree that this is a difficult area to discuss. Basically, it just doesn't fit into language very well; we always end up circling the topic, pointing at it. As soon as you think or talk about it, you are in fact thinking or talking about something else - but *as* it. See the sandcastle metaphor, with its castles on and as "the beach" and also "sand", for example.

PART ONE: Awareness & People

> I realise that the only awareness you can prove the existence of is your own - but does it follow that the other people you experience in the world lack awareness?

The thing is, though, it's not *your* awareness. It's just "awareness", which is taking on the shape of an experience, the experience of being a person in a world, "as if" it were a person. So the awareness doesn't belong to the person; it's better to say that the "idea" of all people is within awareness - the "idea of a world" - and at this moment it has taken on, or unfolded, the sensory aspect of one part of that idea. So it wouldn't be that other people lack awareness; even *you-as-person* lacks awareness and is just a pattern. The only awareness, the only intelligence and causal agent, is *you-as-awareness*. If the content of experience shifted and took on the shape of some other person's perspective, it would still be the same *you-as-awareness*, but experiencing the sensory content from a different *you-as-person* perspective. At all times, though, *you-as-awareness* is in a state which corresponds to the implied pattern of the whole world, all people, laid out over all time, deterministically (until a shift occurs via *intention*, that is).

> Are you saying that we merely can't prove other people have awareness or are you saying that we can be definitively certain that the only awareness in the world is our own...

I'm saying that the suggestion that any person "has awareness" is effectively meaningless - and that includes the person you are having an experience of being right now. Directly attending to your actual experience right now, you can observe immediately that "you" are everywhere, the entire experience is made from "you", that you are "awareness" - and that "you" have no edges and no outside. Furthermore, any thoughts you have *about* being a person or there being an outside *also* arise within that awareness, and that the experience of apparently *being-a-person-in-a-world* is effectively a strand of thought too.

In other words, it turns out that you have to take a step back from *content*, and contemplate the *context* of that content. It turns out that one must reconsider what "you" are, and what "people" and "other people" are. In particular, we must note that there is no perspective other than a 1st-person perspective. As soon as we starting thinking about things from a 3rd-person perspective - employing a "view from nowhere" - then we are *immediately wrong*.

Additionally, all thoughts *about* experience are themselves experience. When we think *about* "the world", that is in effect another world, and not *the* world of our main experience. We confuse our thinking *about* the world with our thinking *of* the world.

> ...and that the capacity to alter the world/other people through consciously intending changes in the pattern proves/indicates this? Which would make you, from my perspective, a sort of automaton?

Better to say "a pattern laid out in time" or something like that. This is just because "automation", to me, implies a sort of programmed "happening", whereas it's probably better to use the metaphor of a *landscape of 3D-immersive snapshots* that is laid out before us, and which we traverse with out attention, moment by moment. The only thing "happening" is awareness unfolding moments in and out of sensory form, and even *that* can be viewed as static, since we can conceive of "time passing" as a static pattern overlaid just as any other.

> It's an uncomfortable notion for me, not that that precludes it from being true, obviously. But it does seem to make things seem sadder and less... consequential.

It's a common feeling. One interpretation of quantum physics, called QBism, returns to the notion of a subjective perspective. The implications of this are clear: that the subjective perspective in effect has a "private copy" of the world, and our experiences are in effect a traversal of memories not bound to an independent notion of time.

Excerpt:

> "But could the problem of the Now lie in relating the present moments of several different people? When you and I are communicating face-to-face I cannot imagine that a live encounter for me could be only a memory for you, or vice versa. When two people are together at an event, if the event is Now for one of them, then it is Now for both. Although this is only an inference for each person, I take it to be as fundamental a feature of two perceiving subjects as the Now is for a single subject."
>
> --- N David Mermin, *Nature*, 26 March 2014

The author *chooses to* believe that a so-called live encounter involves the overlap of two conscious frames, and at the same time. There is no reason to do so in the theory, except that he finds it preferable. Why would he prefer to do this?

Because abstract ideas are *cold and lonely* - whereas the direct experience of such an open, single awareness is vibrant and alive and pleasant. As we cease to grasp onto our apparent individuality as a "person", and by extension our status as an independent entity amongst many separate entities, our attention opens out. Instead of feeling like a Lonely God, we know that we are *all* people *and* the entire world, because we are the one and only awareness, which has taken on the shape or state of all of that. The release from this sense of separation - which is what "other people" implies - turns out to not involve being "one" thing at all, but rather *no-things* because "one thing with no edges" isn't one thing or *any* thing at all; it is "before" division and multiplicity and change.

So, looping back for a moment -

How to approach this is to consider that there is *awareness* or *being-aware* and that is what you are, but that have taken on the shape of *being-a-world-from-the-perspective-of-a-person*. And the way to make this meaningful, is to pause and investigate your direct experience right now. Finally, we note that the only thing that is *fundamentally true* is that which never changes; anything that apparently changes is *content*, the only thing that persists throughout is the *context*, and that is what you are.

The person you think you are, and other people, can be said to be *that*, but it is more understandable to say that there is *that*, and then *that* patterns itself "as if" there were such things as people.

PART TWO: Intention & Mechanism

> The nature of intending and how, exactly, you do that.

This is a really difficult topic, because it goes right to the heart of what we are, and the problems in describing that. Inherently, "intending" involves no mechanism, no division or parts, and hence no cause and effect; there is no action involved and therefore no technique. Which starts to sound uselessly mystical very quickly. I still think we can describe it with metaphors - however practically speaking, as with the recognition of the nature of experiencing, we can only really *be* it. Describing it in words never leads to the thing itself, although ironically it *is* the thing itself.

One possible approach: If "awareness" is *"being"*, perhaps "intending" could be best described as *"becoming"*.

> thoughts cannot alter the thing we're trying to understand any more than they can describe it.

Right. Because thoughts themselves are an *effect*; they are not a cause. If you deliberately think of something right now - how did you produce that thought? You just "did". Meanwhile, if you think the thought "move my arm" and then you experience your arm moving, the thought did not cause the movement; rather, you intended something and the pattern you intended was *both* the thought and the movement. The content of experience is always a *result*; it is the intention that is the only cause. But what *is* an intention? Well really, it is not one thing, any more than there is such a thing as a "movement" independent of there being a specific movement. Also, a movement *is* moving, it *is* the change in arrangement. So there isn't a "we" who causes a "movement" - rather, a change in arrangement occurs, and in language we say that "we" caused a "movement".

> Thus, you can't just think to yourself, if you're white and you want to experience being a black person "I want to be a black person" and have it happen.

If you merely create the thought "I want to be a black person", then you've just summoned a set of words and perhaps some extended imagery into prominence. You have not thought change into the world, as the world. You have created a sort of parallel strand. (The Two Glasses approach is designed to avoid this - more later.)

However, there is an extra element to that - that is, because you are awareness, when you deliberately intensify *any* pattern by thinking it, then you'll likely see it overlaid upon subsequent experience to some extent. If you simply think "an owl" then you get a *general overlay* of owls incorporated into your existing landscape, with its extended pattern "shining through" wherever there is a plausible gap for it to do so. The implicit intention is "the owl pattern will become more dominant in my experience".

What makes the difference between this sort of general patterning - which leads to synchronicity but not to what we'd usually call *results* - is to include spatial and temporal context, and to specifically include within the

intention that this pattern applies to "the world". Sometimes this is explicit, sometimes implicit. It is enough that you simply *know what you mean*; there is no extra thing that needs to be done.

Note: I tend to use the word "intending" to mean the act of intensifying a particular pattern, and "the intention" to refer to the pattern being intensified. This means that, loosely speaking, an intention can always be described in the from "it is true now that _____", because all intending occurs *now*, regardless of the sensory moment being experienced. The entire state of the world is present here, now, all time and space, and every intention is a pattern overlaid upon the entire world-pattern, a shifting of the whole state. "Experience is apparently local; intention is actively global." Phrasing things in that form can help us be clear about what is happening: "It is true now that owls will dominate my experience from this moment onwards"; "It is true now that I will succeed at the meeting in November"; "It is true now that *name-of-world-fact* is *new-value-of-world-fact*"; and so on.

> So to successfully intend something you'd need to access (back to the metaphor) the loom in order to change the pattern. And the loom isn't thought, it's the fundamental truth that "pre-dates" thought.

Yes, you might say that the loom is "before" thought, but you don't need to *access* it as such, because you *are* it. It is perhaps better to dispense with the "loom" metaphor, and say that all there is, is *the material*, and the material has the property of being able to fold itself under its own power. So, no fold in the blanket of material ever causes the appearance of another fold; it is *the material itself* which reshapes itself *as* the folds. It may do so in a way that produces a pattern whereby there is a "thought-shaped fold" and then an "event-shaped fold" side by side, but the first did not cause the second - that is an illusion brought about by our viewing one fold and then the other, and by our ignorance of our own nature.

> Would it be fair to say that techniques like Two Glasses are intended as stepping stones or bridges between thought and the "fundamental truth" which creates the pattern you are experiencing?

The Two Glasses, specifically, misdirects you into doing something mundane while distracting you from what you have associated with it. Earlier, I mentioned the difference between thinking a thought *about* the world, in parallel, and thinking *the world itself*. The Two Glasses basically has you link two patterns to the glasses, and then uses our everyday intuitions about levels to diminish the intensity of contribution of one pattern, in favour of another.

The reason the instructions indicate that you should use a single word, is that this forces the person to "feel out" for a word that best captures the sense of that situation - and this leads to them to actually connect with that pattern, having the word arise *from* that pattern, giving you a "handle" onto it which then becomes associated with the water level in the glass. The pouring of the water from one glass to the other (rather than just emptying one glass and then filling the other separately), leads to a *transformation* of state rather than simply a disconnected change in levels.

If you simply write a description on the labels without doing then, then you tend to get a more general patterning effect, as with the "owls". You have not really connected your situations to the exercise. Now, often the results can be the same, in cases where you (I dunno) just want to see more red cars and less blue, or something - but if you do that, you are working more at the level of pattern overlays rather than world-pattern adjustment.

Aside: One should really view awareness as containing all possible patterns, all possible facts. All patterns are *pre-existing* and are *always* contributing to experience to some extent - just at different relative intensities. In other words, *all facts are true all the time*, and all that changes is "how true" they are at any moment. Intending is the way we change the relative truth of different fact-patterns. Your current state, and hence world-pattern, is the result of all your intentions up until this moment.

> Is there a clearer way to express "intending" and how it's achieved?

Well, I've had a go at it! :-)

> Also, just feel I should mention that I enjoy your posts a great deal. It's a profound and fun topic to kick around - but god it's a frustrating one too, and you seem to have endless patience with johnny-come-lateleys to the subject.

Thanks. Yeah, I think it's a lot of fun to explore. Everyone's a johnny-come-lateley at some point, and every time we have a conversation about this stuff, it's always a little bit different, because everyone's coming to it from a slightly different history - new metaphors or ideas emerge - so I like to engage when I've got time. It's not like I've got the best and final description, after all; this is just me experimenting with how to formulate the same old thing in a modern way that makes sense to me.

[...]

(I do aim to write all this up as a proper essay post at some point soon, in a structure that builds up piece by piece, but for now let me continue along this thread.)

Meaning

So, most of these questions are actually "meaningless". I don't mean that in a dismissive way - the sense in which they are "meaningless" is in the same sense that it is meaningless to ask how many corners a circle has, or what colour "length" is, or what the radius of infinity might be. Another way of saying this, is that there are numerous "castles in the sky": self-consistent pieces of architecture with unique layouts. Many of these questions are like asking navigational information for one castle, based on the blueprints of another. In order to answer the question, you have to take a step back and look at the *context* of the question and not just its *content*.

Which is exactly how we have to proceed when it comes to understanding "dimensional jumping" and the overall understanding that it leads to. We find ourselves dealing with situations where it's not a case of *not knowing something*, and it's not a case of there being something but we can never know it; it's more like there is no "something" to know or not know. It is logically excluded from the architecture of the "castle" you are actually living in, versus the floor plan you have been looking at.

Solipsism

Let us take "solipsism" as an example. There are many definitions, but let's go with this one: "my experience is the only experience that is happening".

To make sense of this statement, we are going to look closely at what we mean by the terms "my", "experience" and "happening". If we were to discover that the statement is in fact presupposing entities or occurrences

which we can not actually find in our experience, we would have to reconsider the *meaning* of our position - for example, if it turned out that "I" didn't have experiences at all, because I couldn't find an "I".

Taking this further, when I examined what I truly meant by "experience", I might find that it is not as I had assumed - perhaps even to the extent that talking about "other people" was nonsensical from a fundamental perspective, because there were *no* people, at least in the way I had originally conceived of them.

More specifically relevant to your questions, though, is the idea of there being multiple experiences, and those experiences overlapping with one another. Now, we can *think about* this - but we immediately have a problem when we do that. Which is, that thinking about something *inherently requires experience to have already been divided*. If we then look at the "thought *about* experiencing" and assume that it has similar properties to *actual* experiencing, we will lead ourselves astray - because the properties of a thought are *not* the properties of experiencing, which "takes on the shape of" thought by dividing itself, but is not *itself* inherently divided.

So, when we are talking about "multiple experiences happening and overlapping", we are looking at the *content* of thought when we need to be looking at the *context* or source of thought, to understand the true situation.

Exercises

There are two little exercises I can think of which might help with this. They are intended to generate an experience, an answer you *feel-know* rather than a verbal description:

1. *"The End of the World"*

   Imagine a sphere floating in front of you. Now, contemplate the idea of being the surface of that sphere. When you first imagined the sphere, it was from a "view from nowhere". When you switched perspective, that first view would make no sense within the logic of "being the surface of a where". The surface of the sphere would not be able to *think about* its own context as a ball within a larger space. However, the "experiencing awareness" in the first instance is identical to that in the second - it has merely taken on the shape of a different perspective.

   Currently, now, you might consider yourself as having taken on the shape of the experience "being the surface of the sphere". Someone starts talking to you about what it is like to take on the shape of "viewing the sphere from space". You cannot understand it. You keep asking what the curvature of that space is, and how you get there, and so on, trying to understand your surface in terms of that space. However, this cannot be done. There is no curvature, and there is no way to get there via an action as the surface. Only by shifting and *becoming* the other view, can you comprehend it - and this must be done *directly*.

2. *"The Place You Are Looking Out From"*

   You are currently looking at these words on this screen. Your attention is on this screen. Now, pause for a moment, and also direct your attention to the "place you are looking out from"; the direction that is opposite to the direction the screen is in.

   What do you find there? What does this mean in terms of the rest of the experience you are having right now? Does this have implications for the *content* of experience versus the *context* of experience?

Answers

I realise I'm not answering your questions directly, but hopefully you can see that: a) this is not really possible, because the answer is actually an *experience* rather than a verbal description; b) the process of looking for the answer is how you get the experience, so there's not much point in me just trying to say it. Make sense? Once the experience is shared, of course, then we are talking from the same understanding, and the same words take on a different meaning (and sound less obscure and koan-like).

Can maybe go through the actual questions next time.

Reply to “If we are creating our reality”

There's no co-creation, because fundamentally speaking there isn't more than one person - or in fact *even* one person. Ultimately, you need to consider some of your assumptions, specifically the assumption that you are a *person-object* located within a *world-place*, and that "the world" is a "stable, simply-shared, spatially-extended 'place' unfolding in 'time'". The idea of the exercises listed in the sidebar, is to perhaps produce experiences (or not) which challenge these assumptions (or not). However, you can actually just pause right now and examine your *actual* experience *as it actually is* - separate from any descriptions you might have *about* it. The idea is to check whether you are truly having an experience of *being-a-person* or whether you are "something else" which is merely having an experience "as if" they are a person.

For example, just to get you thinking (actually do the exercise though rather than just pondering it):

Feeling Out Exercise

... a little exercise can help give us a direct experience of what it means to be the subject to all experience, to recognise that we are not an object and that we are "unlocated". We might close our eyes and try to:

a) find the "edges" of your current experience.
b) find where "you" are in your current experience. *and:*
c) investigate what your current is experience is "made from". *finally:*
d) think about yourself, and then note the location of that thought and what it is "made from".

The conclusions of this are the *direct facts* of your experience - the only actual facts, really; everything else is transitory. Whatever you *think about* your experience is also another experience within this context. You can never get "behind" or "outside" of this, because it has not edges or boundaries; there *is* no behind or outside. (If you think otherwise, then pause and notice that your thought about this is *also* "within" and "inside".)

Reply to “How altering your perception and changing universes tie themselves together, my personal theory.”

To avoid the awkward boundary between minor and major changes, could we just declare that we are "private views" which have access to a shared resource of information ("the world")? In other words, we don't have a server running our instance of the world, that's done by ourselves - based on selecting patterns from a collection of *all* possible experiences from all possible perspectives. We can avoid solipsism there by declaring that different perspectives do exist and share the same resource, although they don't share a time and space.

The extra bit would be: Maybe the world doesn't need to be "run" like a computer system at all. It's much more basic than that, a matter of accumulated observations automatically and spontaneously leading to more-world-on-demand. We can call this "creation by implication". I think of it a bit like how layering two patterns over each other combines into a new pattern. Nobody "made" the resulting pattern, it just naturally emerges from the patterns that have been laid down so far. Making deliberate changes (reality-shifting or dimensional jumping) is then just a matter of artificially triggering certain patterns using the mind, increasing their contribution to the private world experience vs that of others.

Reply to “The Value of "Vibration" (or "Frequency")”

The only thing that is *fundamentally* true is the fact of the property of *being-aware*, or "awareness". There are no other fundamental facts: everything else is relatively true only, as experiences on an "as if" basis. (So our story goes.)

So, you can have experiences "as if" there's such a thing as dimensions, or such a thing as vibrations, and so on. However, they are all actually just metaphors (and really, they are not metaphors *for* anything other than the properties they represent). Even "belief" and "thought" are basically metaphors, used in much the same way. One might say that the experiences are real, but what the experiences are "about" is not real - except in the sense that thoughts about the experiences are real "thoughts about experiences" (and are *themselves* experiences). This all gets us into word tangles pretty quick, as you can see - partly because words and concepts are of course *themselves* yet more experiential content, at the same level as all other content, and therefore any attempt to get "behind" experience is doomed to failure. So what we do is, we *knowingly* choose metaphors and descriptions which have the properties we desire, and "pattern" ourselves with them (basically by attending to them). The "base metaphor" we often use in these discussions (or I do, anyway), is that of "patterns", because it is the minimum structure which can be used while maintaining a coherent, logically consistent view of experience.

Briefly - In this description, we conceive of all possible facts, patterns, experiences already existing, eternally, now. Those patterns are at different levels of relative "intensity" - different levels of *relative contribution*. A particular distribution of intensities corresponds to a "state". This state fully defines your current ongoing experience, as a static "world-pattern" (we can say it includes a "time passing" pattern, which is also actually static). To change state, one changes the relative intensity of the pre-existing patterns, to make one fact "more true" relative to other facts. This is done by intention or by implication - that is, by in some way attending to a pattern such that its contribution increases, deliberately and directly or otherwise.

Since what you truly are is "awareness", then this shift constitutes a shift of you; it is a *becoming* rather than a *doing*. We can think of ourselves as "shape-shifters" therefore, with all that this implies. For example, right now you are "awareness" which has "taken on the shape of" the experience of apparently *being-this-person-in-this-world*. There is nothing you can do to cause a change in the world as such - any apparent causal actions are themselves just more experiences, part of the world-pattern. The only true cause is *you-as-awareness*, taking on a different "shape".

Looping back to your question, then -

There is no real difference metaphysically between, say, "dimensions" or "thought-belief" or "vibration" type approaches, however some descriptions are more highly structured and internally coherent than others, and therefore are better candidates for deliberate patterning of our experience. I'd suggest that "vibrations/frequencies" is a bit vague and hand-waving, and that lack of structure (and perhaps lack of *commitment*) tends to lead to similarly vague results - and sometimes becomes a platform for superstitious-type beliefs to fill in the gaps.

[...]

> So I like to think I'm doing *something* right.

Indeed. As you imply, though, it's somewhat a matter of the individual's existing state. It's not that there is a "right thing" to do - like a special technique or method *as such*. Rather, it's the intention behind an act (what me might call its *assigned meaning*), plus the implications that intention and that act have in terms of current patterning.

"Patterning" is really the "meta" description that helps make sense of whether something works or does not, "makes sense", in the abstract. You can think of it as one big associative memory block. Your ability to intend is your ability to manipulate the memory block (recall and change memories). Your ongoing experience is an associative flow of memory. (Here, an "intention" is the pattern you are increasing the relative contribution of, and "intending" is the act of increasing it.)

So, within that, **potentially *anything* can work** - because the "how it works" is also a pattern, in exactly the same way as other facts and outcomes are. The rules are up for amendment just as much as any other fact!

However, in any particular state there are of course some patterns which are present and available versus others. Simply having take on the shape of apparently *being-a-human* comes with certain structures.

One of them, definitely, is that "feeling" operates as a nice easy associative trigger. This counts for both "emotion", where a particular sort of mood slightly increases the relative contribution of all patterns associated with that mood, but more importantly - but much harder to discuss - is *feeling-knowing*. That is, the *felt-sense* of a situation, fact, or "something being true".

This "objectless" pattern is highly selective, and can be *exactly the fact* you are looking for. It's a good thing to experiment with. In fact, upon inspection, you'll probably notice that it's how you navigate the world on a daily basis - you "feel" your way through it. It is an aspect of the "global summary" feeling which, you might say, represents - or *is* - the dissolved entirety of your current state, ever present in and as the background to object-formatted sensory experience.

Reply to “To answer a few very common newbie questions. The name "dimensional jumping" doesn't really describe it well.”

> > Calling it "dimensional jumping" confuses a lot of people. It makes them think that they are jumping to an alternate dimension. It is just you making an alteration in your perception of how you perceive your reality.

Although I'd add: using words like "reality" is problematic also, though. What does it mean to "perceive your reality" and change that? Those terms are quite loaded. The problem with the term "dimensional jumping" isn't necessarily with the words, it's the assumptions that are brought *to* the words. Assumptions about what "you" are and what "the world" is, in the first place. So although the name can be a source of misunderstanding (because it has associations with science-fiction type imagery), the process of unpacking that misunderstanding can be very useful - because it reveals that there is perhaps a much wider misunderstanding underlying that one.

> > You aren't going anywhere.

But then, in what sense are you really ever anywhere anyway? And so on. Ultimately, it *might* turn out that the distinction being made between *literally* changing dimensions and *metaphorically* changing dimensions is not a meaningful one - that they are, in their essential natures, identical.

[...]

It's not that you are "in the wrong", it's that there are multiple ways to consider things, some of which may be more or less useful for one's purpose.

Our eventual aim should (perhaps) be to be able to take the "meta" position: that is, to consider different interpretations as *relatively* true while being held, but recognise that from a *fundamental* position those are just "as if" positions. (Of course, this is a conclusion we would arrive at via personal investigation; it is not something to 'believe in".)

This is where the literal vs metaphorical argument comes in. If you are having experiences "as if" something is true - that is, consistent with a particular metaphor - then it is, surely, indistinguishable from being literally true. We are then left to ponder what is the "nature of experiencing" itself.

[...]

So, that leads to the idea that you could "wake up" out of this current experience, and then you'd have to recontextualise *this* life. However, it's worth considering that you don't wake up out of anything, as such - there is no hierarchy, and hierarchies are just one way of *thinking about* the experience. Rather, your actual experience remains at the same level, it merely changes discontinuously.

As regards *your* "actual history" - in what way do you have such a thing? Your actual experience is, to occasionally have thoughts *about* an *apparent* history - in the ongoing now. If you recall a "past life", it could be the experience of "remembering something", it needn't have "really happened", and so on. Your state could change at any moment, into a state where you had a particular set of multiple lives, and then change again in

an instant to apparently having had *another* particular set. You get the idea. "Souls" and "histories", too, are ways of thinking *about* experiences, perhaps.

However, we can short-circuit all of that, I would say. We might contemplate, if we are going with the "soul" idea: is the soul *inside* a world, or is the experience of an apparent world arising *within* the soul. (Here, I'm going to define "soul" as something like *that-which-is-aware*.) Without resolving that, it's very hard to talk about "other people", because we've not yet addressed in what sense *we* are "a person".

> Could this be another way of saying, that, all "realities" are equally real, or unreal?

Or - that all moments of experience are of the same nature, and it's only the narratives we apply to them that organise them in terms of a hierarchy, and so on. We experience *this moment* then *this moment* then *this moment* (is one way to describe it); it's only our stories that label one moment as "real" and another as "dream".

> We do evolve into higher and higher states of consciousness?

Well, I'd be inclined to say that all patterns and states are pre-existing, and we simply adopt them. In the same way as we might associatively flip through our memories, so we might flip through "moments". The story of "higher states" is similar to the story of "progress" in society. Really, things *change*, with notions of progress or improvement being a parallel narrative, I think. If all moments are available always, then any moment can be brought into experience at any "time" (because "awareness" is "before" time), which means there is no *necessary* development - although "associative traversal" of moments might tend towards an experience of apparent continuous evolution of some sort.

> as a conscious entity...

Are you a "conscious entity", though? It might seem pedantic, but it's important to be clear about the nature of this experience. If what you are is, for example, an "awareness" whose only inherent property is *being-aware*, and which "takes on the shape of" experiential states, resulting in experiences "as if" the dominant fact-patterns that constitute those states are true - then "being a conscious entity" is a formatting of your experience, not what you *are*.

What you *are* in that case is not an object, hence not an entity, at all. There is not actually "one" of you - because what you are is "before" division and multiplicity - and therefore there cannot be more than one "awareness" either, not fundamentally. There is just... "awareness". Which cannot evolve, really. However, it can certainly "take on the shape of" the experience of *apparently* evolving. But equally it could just adopt, on a whim, the state of being at any point of such an apparent evolution!

> And, actually, for several years, this fear of solipsism has bothered "me."

That's a key point, actually: people often push back against anything that has a hint of solipsism about it, because they don't like the idea that there's "only me" or everything is in "my" mind. However, we are not talking about "my" mind at all, because "awareness" isn't a container or a thing.

This is where we get into problems due to language, though. The very fact of using a word suggests an object, meaning we are "already wrong" (the "awareness" that can be spoken of is not the true awareness, to paraphrase). Language and conceptual thinking are already "too late", because they are experiences which are dependent upon the formatting of experience into objects, which are then related in mental space. It is not

possible to think *about*, or have an experience *of*, that which experiences are "made from". That would be like trying to build a sandcastle which is the shape of both "sand" and "the beach". The sandcastle *is* both sand and the beach, but it cannot *capture* those things in form.

All of which suggests that, say, seeking "enlightenment" in experiences is pointless - because all "enlightenment experiences" are simply *more experiences*. You always *are* your nature; it is not something you can find or think about. However, you can *infer* this by noting the content of your experience directly, and how the only thing than never changes is the fact of *being-aware* - that is, a permanent contentless truth.

Ironic indeed! And I think "ironic" is probably a good way to describe experience in general - as good as any, anyway. There's definitely something "mischievous" about the whole thing!

> Q: "Mischievous" ---It's comforting to think the entirety of "existence" is some sort of a joke. Thank you for such an awesome conversation! :)

Our own joke at our own expense, at that! Still, at least we've got a sense of humour eh? That was a nice little exploration - cheers!

Reply to “Jumping for remission of mental illnesses”

I wouldn't separate out bodily and psychological - everything you experience arises in your "aware space". Although you think of your body as being one "thing", your actual experience of it is a collection of disconnected sensations floating in "aware space", along with the visual image of the room your are "in", the sounds and textures, and so on. Your experience of "being anxious" and "being depressed" are also with that space. The "imagination room" is almost a *literal* description of how our ongoing moment is structured.

When depressed and anxious, I'd guess, you probably feel that "you" are contracted, like a small ball of attention in which your whole self tries to cram its way in, and highly constrained. This might be in the head area, perhaps towards the back, and you might feel on high alert and not properly stable on your feet - or you might feel more detached and your body feel separate and very heavy. There's no single experience. However, the common thread is being "localised" rather than "expanded", and that making you feel, as you say, both exposed (a small dot in a large world) and vulnerable (no boundary vs the world). And when change starts to happen, we often feel even *more* exposed as your attentional boundary releases and opens up. Once that's happened, though, then we are the most stable we can be: open in all directions, self-balancing and stable, the world within us rather than against us.

Hard to describe, obviously, but hopefully something in that description makes sense when it comes to your own experience of it.

From your other comment: Lying on the floor definitely works wonders over time - particularly if you remember that you don't only "cease" limiting your body and thoughts, but also your *attentional focus*. You let all of them roam where they may, allowing them to unwind and complete and dissolve and open themselves out. This prevents any accumulation of restrictive focus or intention over time. Which leads us to:

What leads to tension and depression and anxiety in the first place?

I suggest that there is a common bad habit that may contribute to these (and which the daily releasing involved in lying down helps alleviate). That is: when performing tasks or participating in social interactions, rather than simply "intending" the outcome and allowing ourselves to respond spontaneously, we intend the manual control of attentional focus and bodily movement. This has the effect of both intending the outcome *and* intending tension and constriction of space.

For example, while reading these words, have you narrowed your spatial focus down onto the the screen, like a little ray of focus, to "make" the reading happen? Similarly, when you get up from your chair, do you grab onto the sensations of your legs and then move them by operating the muscles? Both of those are sure-fire ways to build up tension, and if you end up with a very narrow focus over the long term, anxiety and depression type feelings are likely to follow.

Instead, one could sit back and "intend" being an open relaxed space, filling the room. Then "intend" to read the words on the screen *without deliberately controlling your body or attentional focus at all*. Just "let the reading happen". You'll find you can stay open and relaxed *and* the reading will occur. Then, when you stand up, once again allow your attention to remain open and, instead of moving your muscles by focusing on them, instead intend being stood up and stay with that intention, without refocusing on your sitting position. Stay open as your body gets up. Notice how much more relaxed and effortless that is.

So - that probably needs a bit of experimentation and exploration, but it is a way you can change your way of "being" on an ongoing basis, to great benefit. And if you *do* feel anxiety coming up, do not defend against it, rather think of it like a wave of sensation rippling across the pond of your awareness. Perhaps not pleasant, but by remaining open and not trying to control it, you allow it to pass across you and fade away. You may even find that it never reaches full intensity, since by remaining open it is never trapped within a small boundary - so it's like a ripple in an ocean rather than a splash in a glass of water. (Again, something to experiment with, to discover how it is for you, in particular.)

Reply to “I did the two glasses thing”

Relax! Perhaps you need to change how you are thinking of this generally. Instead of thinking that you are jumping between universes, like some sort of inter-dimensional soul, instead think of it as having a "private copy" of the world, a copy which you can modify. This means that if you intend a change (and note that change happens instantly, even though the signs of it may appear only later) you can always intend a compensating change later - because you haven't *left* anywhere, you've *changed* somewhere. It's called "jumping" because the changes can be such that the *facts of the world* shift in your ongoing experience, meaning it seems "as if" you have gone to another universe. Meanwhile, don't go reading fictional scare stories and taking them seriously. In effect, the underlying concept of "dimensional jumping" is extremely simply and you have been accidentally using it all your life. That is,

- *"Sensory experience is apparently local, but intention is always actively global."*

Until now, you've only been using deliberate intention for, basically, summoning body movements as you roam around the world. Actually, though, *any intention* shifts the entire world-pattern to some degree, is overlaid upon it, so intending a change in a "world fact" and intending a change in your arm position are identical in kind.

The Two Glasses exercise is a structured way of "re-patterning" your experience by attaching to a current and target state and transforming their relative intensities or contributions to the world. There's no reason to fear - you're not going to encounter a bad outcome unless you deliberately (and I mean *deliberately*, I don't just mean a passing thought or whatever) intend for one.

> > I saw Kynari say in some thread that we are shifting all of the time, naturally. What exactly does that mean?

Personally, I don't think that's a very helpful statement, although I get why they might say it. Let me lay out a line of reasoning that you could use to interpret it. Let's imagine that you have a "private copy" of the world. Right now, that world can be described as a particular pattern of facts - the world is in a particular "state". This state fully determines the moments of experience that are going to appear in your awareness, from now into the future. This includes the things you are going to see happening around you *and* your bodily movements, and so on. If right now you simply "cease interfering", your ongoing experience will continue spontaneously, in accordance with that state.

Let's say that this "state" = "a dimension".

Meanwhile, we will call deliberately interfering with that spontaneous flow of moments "intention". If you "intend" something, then you are shifting your state to incorporate the "intention" into it. Once you have "intended", the state now includes that new pattern ("the intention") and you will now experience a *new* deterministic path defined by that new state.

Aside: To get an everyday feel for this, "intend" right now to go and get a drink of water - and don't interfere with what happens. You'll find that your body will move "by itself" to get and get the water. Your new state now includes the intention and the experience happens accordingly. Note that if you are someone who has developed the habit of constantly "asserting their bodily position", you might feel that nothing happens. If this is the case, first intend to "cease interfering", and *then* intend the task.

So, from this we might say that every time we deliberately intend something then we are "shifting dimensions". This includes intending that we do in resistance to the experiences that appear. However, we typically do *not* intend constantly, and so we are *not* "shifting all of the time". A shift is *not* the same as a bodily movement or a passing thought; those are spontaneous pre-determined arisings from the *current* state.

Ideally, then, we should live our lives as a spontaneous, effortless, resistant-less unfolding - with only *occasional* redirections (shifts) via deliberate intention. This is where all the talk about "detachment" and "allowing" and "trust and faith" and "absolute surrender" comes from: only by letting go of trying to control each moment, do we gain control of our overall experience. (But even if we don't let go, we are still not "shifting all the time", because the resistance itself will lead to a fixed state - just an unpleasant one.)

TL;DR: We are not "shifting all the time"; we change state only when we deliberately intend change; mostly people do not do that except in the case of occasional resistance to experience; many people probably don't actually intend *at all*.

Reply to “Cancelling the two glasses experiment”

The issue is probably that you've wished for an "opening out" contrary to the very thing that your anxiety is related to - that is, attempting to control the events in the space which surround you by maintaining a distance from them, probably by tightly narrowing your attention in your body space. So, you are now moving towards being "the open space in which experiences arise" - and finding it initially makes you feel very vulnerable and exposed. *The anxiety, I suggest,* ***is*** *the experience of fighting to prevent this happening by holding onto your attention and tension.*

It feels like you are going to die, because you have become so used to a certain feeling of "holding on" and "being located" that you have identified that as "you"; so when you relax and that dissolves, it seems like *you* are dissolving. But you're not. Your attention is just relaxing into being the "open awareness" that you are always are. You are the "container" in which those sensations arise, you are not any one of them. Of course, if you don't like this, you can always do another Two Glasses session and intend to return to your constrained state - however...

You should perhaps treat this as a lesson: if you want to no longer be anxious, you *have* to allow yourself to open out, and that will *inevitably* make you feel uncomfortable as it unfolds. Your anxiety *is* your resistance to this. This release will probably happen eventually anyway in the years to come: you'll eventually exhaust yourself by trying to maintain this defensive, constrained focus, and it'll break down by itself. It might be better to do so by choice, now?

To ponder: What, *exactly*, are you anxious about? Or is the anxiety simply what the experience of staying super-constrained feels like, and you've become trapped in that state because the initial experience of releasing out again feels threatening?

You can definitely do another "2G", but I would pause and contemplate what you actually want in the target situation first. Relax, think about how you want to feel, connect with that idea - *and let the appropriate word arise from that feeling.* Phrases like "perfect health" are all very well, but they are kinda generic and nonspecific. It is better to be precise (and have the courage to actually choose exactly what you are after).

Remember, the words used aren't meant to be "messages to the universe"; they aren't descriptions of what you want. Rather, they are "handles" onto pre-existing patterns and states that you want to move from/to as part of a transformation. *That* is what the exercise actually is. And that's why it's best to actually ponder the target and have the words emerge that "feel right" for encapsulating, connecting with the initial/target state. Meanwhile, those passing thoughts will fade in time; it is completely understandable to have had them, as part of your situation, but they will stop being relevant as things improve. They probably arise from the painful areas themselves. Although they can be disturbing, that are basically just audio-visual fragments of experience, like any other; they are not *insightful*. Something you might experiment with, though, is feeling out to become the space in which your sensations - including your pains - arise. If you are narrow focused spatially, then your pain is like a wave in a glass of water; instead, by opening out, you can work towards making it a ripple in an ocean.

Exercise: Standing as Awareness

- Close your eyes right now.
- Now, "feel out" with your mind into the room in front of you, like you are expanding your "presence" out into the space around you.
- Then, adding to that, "feel out" into the space behind you, either side, down into the ground, and up above you.
- Now, also include the space that your body occupies. You should now feel that you are a continuous "space" within which your body sensations and perceptions are floating.
- Listen to the sounds in the background. Notice that you are both "here" where your body sensations are, and "over there" where the sound is. The sound is arising within that space - within you!
- Now, "feel out" in each direction, and try to find the edge of this "space" - try and find the boundary. Is there one? Or is it an infinite space that goes on forever?
- Finally, can you find any part of that space in which "you" are not there? Or are *you-as-awareness* actually apparently everywhere, and infinite?
- To finish: note that this unbounded infinity is not a cold, lonely space devoid of life - rather, it is a warm, welcoming space of bubbling potential that is alive, and that this space is you.

And for you, an extra bit:

- While staying "open" like this, be sure to *include the volume of space where your pain is* into that openness. Allow yourself to "sit with" the painful areas, but with them being a seamless part of your larger aware space. If shifts and changes start to occur, allow them to unfold as they want, without interference.

Reply to “Did the two glasses experiment. Nothing happened.”

Uh-huh, nice. So the glasses technique = "plausible if very unlikely" routes, rather than immediate discontinuity, in general. And the level of plausibility depends, really, on your own patterning to date. But if you've done it with intention, you'll always get results of some sort. See what happens over the next week or so.

> > So, which techniques are capable of producing immediate discontinuity? I'd find it much more convincing if I could experience that rather than something that might have happened even if I did nothing.

What, exactly, are you wanting to be convinced of? (Bearing in mind that nobody's particularly interested in convincing you of anything, although everyone's happy to help you towards any specific goal you might have.)

The problem is, "wanting to be convinced" isn't a very good goal - because it's nonspecific, and it's not really a goal at all. It's like "wanting to be convinced that I can run a Marathon" rather than "wanting to complete a Marathon". You best become convinced by targeting experiencing-the-goal, not by targeting being-convinced. "Techniques", of course, aren't capable of anything. Only you are. Techniques are just a path for your intention to be directed along. Which means a certain focus and commitment. It's relatively easy to get what you want through apparently "plausible if very unlikely" routes. But if what you are desiring to do is break your plausibility level, as it were, then you can work on that, but you'll either have to dedicate yourself to it (rather than "want to be convinced") or let yourself got insane for a while. Again, it's not the technique that does it for you, it's you that does it, so you have to actually commit. The universe isn't like a simulation running on a computer; it doesn't do anything of you. It's more like a static list of entangled facts or a complex diagram that you are scanning your attention across, and you have the ability to edit it.

Me, World, Experience

> >I want to know what kind of world I live in.

This is the crux of it, then. Really, I would suggest starting there, and working outwards from that. And I'd say it's better to phrase it something like this though, since it assumes less:

- *What, exactly, is the nature of my current experience?*
- *By extension, what is the nature of "me" and "the world"?*

That's something that can be established by direct attention. You can fairly straightforwardly satisfy yourself that everything you experience appears in your "mind" (although that's not really a very good word for it since it's not a personal mind), including any thoughts about a supposed external world. You can't *think* your way to this though, since you'll just keep going round the same conceptual frameworks; you have to directly perceive it to be the case, in the moment.

Cause, Effect, Experiment

> I learn nothing via a "plausible if very unlikely" route.

It can be a slight Catch-22, this, because there's an element of having to soften up your own patterning in order to have more unusual intentional experiences - which in turn is effectively a widening of what counts as "plausible if very unlikely". And this applies to perceiving your actual experience too: you have to assert it in order to have the corresponding experience. It's a little like being a shape-shifter:

- If you were a shape-shifter, how would you describe the process of shape-shifting? You would just "become" the new shape; it's all you, so there's no one part causing the other part.

  Continuing with this: how would you work out you were a shape-shifter? The only way would be... to shift your shape. There would be no evidence of you being a shape-shifter between shiftings. Intention and deciding and all that, have similar problems: you reveal them by becoming them.

In other words, the more rule-breaking you want your experiences to be, the more you have to break yourself, or (and this is where detachment comes in) you temporarily suspend yourself in terms of patterning. The traditional way to prove the flexibility of experience it the same way as is used for all experimentation: repetition. Performing an intentional act and having corresponding results is the only way to establish a causal link.

Raise your arm now. How do you know that your arm wouldn't have lifted up in any case? How, *exactly*, do you go about raising your arm anyway? Do you really cause it in a particular way that you can detect, other than just "wanting" it to happen?

Maybe your arm is just part of the external world and you just *assume* it is "yours" and under your control because it is apparently nearer to where you think of yourself as being centred. Actually, your arm and the rest of your body are moving by themselves beyond your control, and the same applies to the thought that you do it. How could you tell the difference?

You get the idea: you can't answer these questions, except by repeating the experiment again and noticing a correlation between "asking" for the movement and "receiving" it subsequently.

Plan of Attack

So, unless you want to dedicate yourself to a bit of a blind reformatting (which you can do: it's essentially like meditation but with persistent intention) I'd suggest a plan of attack of this form:

1. Spend time directly investigating the nature of your experience, to establish that it is entirely within "a" mind, and that you are "a" mind and not any of the content which appears within it.
2. Perform the owl exercise for different subjects, allowing intervals between each experiment, see what appears in your experience subsequently. Repeat.
3. Perform the two glasses exercises for different personal situations, allowing intervals between each experiment, see what appears in your experience subsequently. Repeat.

In other words, treat it as a proper study and conduct a structured investigation. Otherwise, through a lack of understanding, you can end up asking the philosophical idealism equivalent of:

- *"If everything is really made from atoms, that means the world is mostly empty space, so how come I can't walk through walls?"*

[...]

> Maybe they've been encountering pictures of owls on the Web and elsewhere regularly all along.

I can't help but notice that you're thinking about this, rather than actually doing it. Either do the experiment, or don't bother. Without the experiment, you are completely uninformed. You're just sloshing about in your own thoughts. When the owl exercise kicks in, it becomes pretty obvious that it goes beyond confirmation bias. The reason it's dubbed The Owls Of Eternity™ is as a bit of fun, but it's relevant because the persuasiveness of it is that owls apparently come to you as events, and as encounters which suggest retroactive change.

The progression of plausibility develops something like this:

- conf. bias > coincidence > synchronicity > "manifestation" > shifting > "jumping"

And the apparent location of the encounters like this:

- internal > external > eternal

The extended pattern thing, that's just what seems to happen, but anyone doing the exercise is perfectly able to be more specific in their intention and to decide what counts and what doesn't. Remember, the point of that exercise is simply a bit of fun to demonstrate (without having to put any effort in) the *pattern-based nature of experience* in a way that shows it's not simply selection from pre-existing scenes. Or at least, not pre-existing scenes in 3D; you could describe it as selection from a 4D environment. With that experience under your belt, you've got a flavour of the thing, and it's easy enough for you to design your own rigorous experiment if you like.

Again though, nobody can prove anything to you in this area, just as, for instance, nobody can prove to you that you can be awake in your dreams ("lucid dreaming"), or that there's such a thing as experiencing oneness ("enlightenment"). Or that it's possible for you to train up and run the marathon. If you want to explore how your world works, then you'll have to conduct the investigation yourself. Nobody can do it for you.

In other words: Do it, or don't do it, but if you don't do it, there's no point in discussing it.

[...]

> That doesn't sound like jumping to another dimension to me. It sounds more like The Secret.

Well, it's not that. It more like an umbrella term for "applied philosophical idealism" to force 'glitches' via pattern-shifting.

> [This] revolve[s] around the notion that physical reality can be manipulated by the mind because it is a construct of the mind.

Pretty much - although exactly what we mean by those terms matters; strictly speaking there is no physical reality as usually thought of, and the word "construct" implies a separation that isn't there.

You might see "patterning" as the generalised idea behind all experience. From moving your arm to changing the world, it's all the same. It's a ground-up account.

For instance, here, the idea that the world is a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time" is pretty much thrown away. Space and time arise with experience and not outside of it. In this sense, this is a bit like "magick" but rooted in the philosophy of, say, George Berkeley's *Three Dialogues*, Kant's transcendental idealism, and the non-duality traditions. An applied metaphysics that deals with a personal subjective slice of the world, a private copy within you.

Meanwhile, the Law of Attraction (attracted from where, how?) and The Secret (worse) are basically crap magick, poorly applied and without a properly defined worldview. They do have the advantage that you don't need to flip your world around to think about them; but they have the disadvantage of not really making sense or working very well as described.

Reply to “2 glass method”

As for guides, that's all there is: those instructions, as written, done without adding anything else (this includes avoiding extra actions or extra "concentrating", etc, because you think it might help force it or whatever). Anything added in this way would just be extra "sensory theatre" on top; "effort" is actually counter-productive here; the exercise is deliberately stripped right down to the bare bones to avoid this.

Give it about a week after each exercise, I'd say, being sure to follow the final instruction, to see what results arise.

Note that, since this is an *experiment* rather than a *method* or *technique*, you should treat this as a bit of an "investigation into the nature of experience". Getting a result is a confirmation, of course, but it is also about finding out "how things are" - insight! - rather than blindly doing methods, hoping you "got it right" or whatever, then moving on once its achieved.

> What investigative conclusions can be drawn, instead, from not getting results?

From not getting your *specific target outcome*, sometimes one can still reach conclusions, or at least derive some sense of an overall direction in how one thinks about experiences and actions.

For example, perhaps other experiences arise which seem to be associated with the "extended pattern" of the target outcome. And the *manner* in which those arise suggests something about the nature of experience, and in turn clarifies what you were actually doing when you performed the exercise (versus your assumptions about it). In particular, the idea of the world as a "place" with you as a sort of "person-object" located within it, might start to be viewed more critically. And what "performing actions" really consists of, more generally. And so on.

> How can we manage to see "magic" in the apparent absence of it?

It is not necessarily about seeing "magic", though. It is about seeing "how things are". That "magical experiences" may result from this, or the possibility of them opens up, is a consequence of that, but not the purpose of it *as such*. Anyway: The things you list are examples of the sorts of patterns one might observe, in fact.

More to the point, one often encounters something along the lines of a flat pattern (by which I mean a sort of basic concept to do with the intention) being overlaid upon or incorporated into a 3D-sensory experience in a non-temporal, non-spatial way. That is, contrary to the *object-and-place* view, more in line with an *awareness-taking-on-the-shape-of-experiences* view. Which *is* a result in the sense of having affected experience, albeit not (yet) what one might have been after.

In any case, the intending exercise (being an exercise, an *experiment*) doesn't "fail" simply because the specific result one was after doesn't occur in the form one wanted it to - if it provides feedback which can be incorporated into one's thinking and approaches. It's not a black or white thing. That is why it is not called a "method" or "technique".

For example, you could notice that you got what you *intended* ("the pattern that you intensified") rather than what you *wanted* ("the story you had about your desire becoming a reality"), and there is a difference between

the two. And difference between the content of the two can tip you off about what you were *actually* doing rather than what you *thought* you were doing - etc.

As for "back to materialism", that's probably better dealt with more directly anyway - by attending to your experience in the moment and noticing how it is (as a context), rather than simply messing around with the content. There is always *some* materialist-type description that can be hacked together to explain the content of an outcome (just add more bridging concepts, or revert to brain-related explanations). Observing that materialism is unsupported due to the absence of any actual experience of some material, it probably more efficient.

I'd like to add, though: Critical faculties should always be engaged, and the test of whether an intentional act *worked* is certainly whether the target outcome arises in experience. None of the above should be used for excuse-making for deluding oneself that there is something going on, if the evidence is weak. It's just that viewing it as a "pass/fail" test isn't the best way to approach this, since ultimately one is trying to work out the nature of things, rather than just scrambling around for some "secret method" without understanding anything.

The final instruction really means: "stop fiddling". No checking, no redoing, no counter-intending. The work is already done.

When you perform the exercise, you should consider that it becomes "true *now* that this happens *then*" at the moment you complete it. After the exercise, you are from that point encountering a new set of predefined moments playing out within your experience, arising from your new state.

Carrying on with your life, then, doesn't mean you have to specifically do what you were doing before! If it occurs to you to do something, then do it: that is part of the new state. But there is no "working things out" required; there is no effort involved in this and you don't need to "help things along". In fact, you *can't* do this - work out what to do - because you have no idea of how things are going to play out in detail: you can't "pre-experience" your experiences. You just have to let them arise. Perhaps new inclinations and events will arise in the days and weeks that follow. You'll "find yourself doing things". Those are arising from your new state! You just go along with them.

As a general suggestion, though: If in daily life you find yourself sort of stuck, trying to work out what you are meant to be doing, just pause and ask yourself: "what needs doing next?". And wait for an answer to appear in your mind (in other words don't "work it out"). Then, no matter how you *feel* about that thing when you think about it, *do that thing* regardless - and you'll recover your momentum.

Reply to “Which method to use to achieve future goal?”

Just for super clarity, I'd probably highlight issues with the use of "unconsciously" with the word "choosing", because of how loaded that term is, and how varied its uses.

It's easier, I think, to reserve "choices" for intentions, where "intending" means deliberate selection and intensification of a pattern to make it relatively more prominent in our experience ("the intention"). I'd perhaps strip it back to simply: we can intend outcomes or facts - shift ourselves - but sometimes the extended pattern implied by those intentions is not anticipated.

For example, you might react to an encounter with someone you like but are shy of by intending them to "go away"; and they do. You *could* say that you "unconsciously chose" to make it so you never have a relationship with that person, but I think that doesn't really capture what's actually going on. "The unconscious" is a problem because people tend to think of it as both a place and a process, somehow separate from ongoing experience, but which has a mind of its own and does things - whereas it's really just a way of saying "aspects of your current patterning which are not unpacked into this expanded sensory moment", like Bohm's ink droplet analogy.

> [**Ink droplet analogy**
>
> Bohm also used the term unfoldment to characterise processes in which the explicate order becomes relevant (or "relevated"). Bohm likens unfoldment also to the decoding of a television signal to produce a sensible image on a screen. The signal, screen, and television electronics in this analogy represent the implicate order, while the image produced represents the explicate order. He also uses an example in which an ink droplet can be introduced into a highly viscous substance (such as glycerine), and the substance rotated very slowly, such that there is negligible diffusion of the substance. In this example, the droplet becomes a thread, which in turn eventually becomes invisible. However, by rotating the substance in the reverse direction, the droplet can essentially reform. When it is invisible, according to Bohm, the order of the ink droplet as a pattern can be said to be implicate within the substance.
>
> In another analogy, Bohm asks us to consider a pattern produced by making small cuts in a folded piece of paper and then, literally, unfolding it. Widely separated elements of the pattern are, in actuality, produced by the same original cut in the folded piece of paper. Here, the cuts in the folded paper represent the implicate order, and the unfolded pattern represents the explicate order.]

***You* are the only mind**, and the state of your world is a static landscape that cannot shift unless you shift it/yourself. *You* are the only thing that "happens". So, "unconscious" in the sense of not being explicitly aware of what we have done - not having a thought *about* that - but not in the sense of there being something "happening" behind the scenes.

But then, of course, *our entire state right now* is of that "unpacked" type. Our current patterning is, other than this current "sensory moment", in the background rather then unfolded into explicit knowing (=experience). Only the current "sensory moment" or an explicitly chosen intention, while being intended or recalled, are not of that type.

> Perhaps it's a better term to use overall, but it only makes sense if you truly know what you're doing.

The problem is, when we begin with these terms we've already created a hurdle for understanding it properly. "Conscious-unconscious", given that people tend to conceive of these things as "happening" independently in some sense, is already built upon an error and rich with unhelpful associations, some of which are very difficult to point out, to the extent that it's better to put them aside. Of course, in casual conversation, unlike here, then we start with whatever way in might be easiest, and then try to lead things around. But at some point, inevitably, you have to just assert the viewpoint - either by asserting that there is such a thing as "intention" and building out, or by leading them through an exercise like *Feeling Out* and so on - and build out from that, as a parallel picture of things. In these conversations, naturally, we're all about digging into these things, and I'm not particularly aiming at generating snappy few-liner descriptions that can be given to people without establishing a background first. However, a side effect of this tends to be the generation of new metaphors which *can* be helpful in that area.

> Why would negative feelings arise if that's not what I'm focusing on anymore?

They are aspects of your current state, which will always have some patterning from previous intentions and implications - which typically become less conspicuous over time. (Remember, here, that the state is static, so more accurately they don't "become" less conspicuous, it's just true *now* that the pattern is less dominant across the static set of moments.)

With *passing* thoughts and feelings, then, just let them be and they'll just be left behind. Wrestling with the content of every moment is a sure way to get into trouble. If a thought or feeling *persists*, then intend the desired feeling. And, again, let *it* be too. You are not meant to be managing your ongoing experience in some sort of constant maintenance mode.

> so it does seem like this could improve drastically as I keep putting more focus into it.

I'd say it's not *necessarily* about "putting focus into" so much as "do not subsequently interfere" - depending on what is meant by that ("putting focus"). This is something to experiment with a bit, but since your intentional reactions to surroundings can be in terms of a depressed state, you can end up recreating it. After which, when you notice this has occurred, you can re-intend feeling good again of course - but:

I'd like to caution against "keeping focused on" in some sort of ongoing sense, like a "forcing" more than simple one-hit "decisions". This can become another version of holding yourself in a fixed position *in opposition to* the moments that you have defined in your state previously. Intention can best be considered as as "redirection" or "assertion", not as a process that needs maintenance, otherwise you are in fact holding a moment, rather than modifying your state while avoiding obstructing the unfolding of your sensory experience.

"Putting focus into" in the sense of "intending when I notice that I have counter-intended" is perfectly fine, of course.

It's fine to invoke any concept, but we just have to be more careful than we would when discussing other topics - because in this case the thing we are discussing is also about *the nature of concepts* (or descriptions). Every concept comes with baggage, and accumulates more over time. Worse - "God" being a classic one, but "consciousness" too - many concepts turn out to be sort of meaningless, because we tend not to take the time

to define them. (For example, reading "consciousness explained" type articles is often fascinating, because usually - inevitably - the article turns out to be about *this other thing*, but with it being labeled "consciousness".)

As you pointed out earlier, though, this just means we need to engage in a dialogue to whittle down what exactly we mean by the terms we are using. And I do think that, if we introduce the "meta" idea of "experiencing" as being independent of, the *context* to, any *content*, then we've always got a platform we can retreat to in order to regain our footing.

Anyway -

There's probably an interesting point to be made about whether or not to treat any content as "important" (or as "signs"). It's best to treat them just as they are actually experienced: multi-sensory 3D imagery, within awareness, with a feeling of "meaning" with it. Any further interpretation is itself a further experience: the experience of "thinking about" that experience.

Meanwhile, if you don't regularly re-imply something, then the pattern tends to fade, simply because *other* intentions towards desired "fact-patterns" will tend to imply the reduced contribution of that something, simply as part of the world-experience being fairly consistent. As I say, though, there's nothing wrong with regularly intending "being happy" or whatever, but this is not the same as manipulating or maintaining the ongoing sensory moment. It is more like "asserting a fact" into the background of experience, such that subsequent sensory moments arise in alignment with that, later.

The total simplicity of this does, ironically, lead to lots of verbiage in an attempt to capture it. Ultimately, we are talking about an undivided non-thing - but since words and concepts require division (that is, the breaking up of things into "parts" and then relating them within a "conceptual space"), we immediately create an error even in the attempt to capture it (if we are talking in terms of divisions, we are already *not* talking about the undivided thing), and flip from zero complexity to endless complexity.

Trying to talk about "awareness" suffers from this. It's not a *thing* at all, and nor is it even the material that things are made from, although that's still a useful metaphor. The concept "awareness" is immediately inaccurate, because simply the fact of dealing with a concept means we aren't talking about *awareness-as-it-is*, which is "before" concepts.

And talking about "intention" suffers from the same issue. Intention is not about entertaining thoughts or feelings or whatever. Intention is *the reshaping of oneself, by oneself*. "Entertaining thoughts" is a *result* - an experience. So it cannot be a *cause*. Experiences are *results* of intention, so if we find ourselves talking about something to "do", we are already talking about something other than intention.

It's actually better to start with the concept of a "state" and have intention simply be a modification of the state, with sensory experiences being aspects of the current state. That way, you have a nice clear model:

You are "awareness". The only inherent property of "awareness" is *being-aware*. Awareness contains all possible patterns, eternally. Awareness can be in a "state" where some patterns are more prominent than others. Your ongoing sensory experience is the sensory aspect of that "state". "Intending" is the name given to increasing the relative prominence of a pattern ("the intention") in your state, such that ongoing sensory experience reflects that (because it just *is* an aspect of that patterned state). All experiences are *results*. The only *cause* is the state/intention.

Of course, this inherently means that neither "awareness" nor "intending" can be described, since descriptions are themselves experiential patterns, and are "made from" awareness. Just like you can't build a sandcastle which is the shape of "the beach" and "sand", even though the sandcastle *is* both "the beach" and "sand". (And if you make sandcastles and label them "the beach" and "sand", they are still not those things, although it is likely we will get confused and start treating them as such. Which loops back to where we came in, with our unpicking of terms in order to be certain we meant what we think we meant.)

It's not really passive, though, although I get that the language seems to suggest it.

Saying that the only inherent property is *being-aware* is just to say that the "shape" of it is always inherently an experience. It can then causelessly *shape-shift* itself into any experience (but don't conflate experience with the current "expanded sensory moment" only; something I keep accidentally implying I must admit).

Sometimes, as a brief mental image even though it slightly misleads, I refer to "awareness" as:

- "The non-material material whose only inherent property is *being-aware* and which 'takes on the shape of' states and experiences; right now it has 'taken on the shape of' apparently *being-a-person-object-in-a-world-place*".

Which is more suggestive of the complete idea. Implicit in this description is that all possible patterns are present eternally, are always available, and it's a matter of the "relative intensity of contribution" rather than their existence as such.

Following from that, then: "intending" is the reshaping of *you-as-awareness* such that a given pattern ("the intention") becomes more prominent in its contribution to ongoing experience; "volition" would be a little bit of experiential or imagination theatre whereby you browse patterns and select one to then adopt more fully.

As always, we should highlight that experience just *is* and there's nothing "behind" is - and that includes this description, which is itself just an experience (an experience of "thinking about experience"). So, the description doesn't get "behind" experience or "explain" experience, however it provides a framework for thinking about the essence of a structured experience independent of specific content - it is closer to the "basic experience" - and is useful as a platform for formulating intentions "as if" it were true (which of course intensifies the apparent truth of the description, because whatever patterns an intention is asserted *in terms of*, is also brought into prominence, as part of its extended pattern).

To avoid going astray, though, so that we don't start thinking that this is "how it really works" or gives us a method or mechanism, we keep re-iterating that the only fundamental truth is the fact of "awareness", and *all* other aspects of experience are relatively true (patterning, temporarily) only.

> >The shape-shifting metaphor makes passivity go away, but the adverb "causelessly" seems to bring it back.

The issue here is one of language, again. Language requires that there be a "doer", a "doing", a "done". You can't really describe "movement" without it sounding passive unless you invoke a "mover" - but in this case we are talking about *self-shaping* or *self-movement*, with no "mover" distinct from the "movement", because of course you are the entirety of the experience.

As an attempt to illustrate this: move your arm. Attend to the experience. Do "you" actually "move" your arm, or does the experience of "my arm moving' simply arise? In what sense do you "cause" your arm to move? If you have an experience of "doing" the movement, then what causes *that* experience? Is it not itself a causeless experience, in terms of there being something within your experience that makes the arm move? Is it not the case that the entirety of your ongoing experience is a "result" and not a "cause"? Something to play with, anyway.

> >So, there's nothing "behind" it, but maybe there is something inside it.

Again, this is perhaps best viewed as an issue with language and conceptual thinking - which always involves arranging *object-ideas* within a *conceptual space*, almost like as sort of imaginary "thinking room". There are in fact no hierarchies or locations in what we're talking about here, but there's actually no way to talk about this, since thinking requires division and relation, which is "after" this.

So, really, we must simply accept that we are using metaphors to point to *aspects* of our experience, and sometimes those metaphors will apparently even clash or contradict one another in the details because they are all "wrong" to an extent. The descriptions we are using aren't "explanations" for our experience, they are our best attempts to communicate insights that are observed. "How things are" is never captured by the description, never *are* them; the descriptions merely point to them.

The implicate/explicate orders are one useful image, certainly. But: the implicate order is not actually intended to be spatially located at all, since it is "before" even the formatting pattern of "spatiality". It is useful to refer to it as "enfolded within" our experience, because it gives a sense of the relationship, but the spatial metaphor is not really accurate (since only *spatially-extended experiential content* has spatial extent and this is not that).

Similarly, the "patterning" model tries to use the concept of patterns or ripples, all existing simultaneously and summing up to a state. A bit like Moire fringes. The idea here is to use the minimum required concepts to represent a structured experience, whilst avoiding invoking spatial or temporal metaphors as much as possible. The "sensory aspect" is the current "unfolded" part of that total image, in this description: sensory experience is spatial, but patterns themselves are not. But again, that description is not "true" because no description can be; it is simply an attempt to capture certain aspects of experience such that they can be discussed and, then, used as formulations for intentions.

The summary, then: Experience is *as it is* and is primary; descriptions are pointers to that and are themselves experiences, so it is not possible to have a model which *is* experience. There is actually no "how things are" or "mechanism" or "structure" which is inherent. Models are meant to be "effective" (that is: useful) rather than "true", so arguing about the models can sometimes be a distraction, and that's why the sidebar encourages conducting experiments.

Aside - Models are never "true" even outside of this more "meta" analysis, although unfortunately they are often presented as such at the moment by many people who really should know better. Even in the standard description, the world is not actually, say, made from "atoms". That model was never intended to capture "what is really happening"; it is simply a useful - "effective" - description for many purposes.

> When seeing this, it seems kind of pointless trying to meddle with whatever you're experiencing, because it's not seen so much as an impediment to get somewhere else.

Another way to say this is: If all things already exist, and they are brought into experience by intensifying them, then trying to tinker with the content of the moment is misguided, or at the very least it is limiting. There is no need to "transform" the current experience into the desired one; one simply needs to assert the desired pattern into relative prominence.

Furthermore, the very idea of trying to operate upon the "image" is (in this context) really in error, because the current experience is a *result* or *sensory aspect*, and is not the fact itself. That is, if the sensory aspect is the flames atop a stack of glowing coals, their shape reflecting the arrangement of the stones from which the flames arise and are a part, then trying to modify the flames, while it may adjust their position slightly, does not tackle the pattern of which the flames are merely a visual aspect.

> You needn't be parroting positive things to yourself all day, but if it arises for a while, then go ahead. If negative stuff like "I look like crap" arises, then let that be there, just don't be interested in it. Does that sound accurate?

That sounds accurate. The notion that one must always be "feeling good" or "thinking the right thoughts" - as *passing* aspects of experience - in order for the desired outcome to arise, is flawed. There are two aspects to that:

First, those feelings or thoughts are *results*. Like the flames above. Altering the flames does not alter the facts or the state, beyond perhaps a little intentional extended patterning. The flames are not *casual*. One moment does not cause the next moment: they are both images arising from one's state, which is a static definition which fully determines the sequence of moments (that is, between occasional intentions/shifts of course).

Second, it you intend a particular outcome, then at the moment of intending the state is shifted (because intention *is* the shifting of state) such that the new fact-pattern ("the intention") is incorporated. At that moment, it becomes "true *now* that this happens *then*", with the series of moments between *now* and *then* being fully defined by implication. But:

There is no reason why all those intermediate moments will be filled with "loveliness" and "joy" or "signs of success".

A silly example: If I intend to bump into someone I am attracted to, this may actually come about because I wake up one morning feeling depressed and hopeless, this lasts for a week, eventually I decide to take a walk and go for a coffee in that new coffee shop that's opened even thought it's not my sort of place and shake myself out of it, and they happen to be in the coffee shop.

> You could say everything falls under that rule, since there is no division...

That's where the idea of this all being paradoxical comes in. It isn't *really*, though - the paradoxes lie in our attempt to construct a conceptual framework for it, not in "the thing itself". It's generally convenient to have "awareness" as indescribable, but notionally something like:

- "The non-material material whose only inherent property if *being-aware* but which 'takes on the shape of' states and experiences - and which has presently 'taken on the shape of' apparently being a *person-object* in a *world-place*".

> but is it fair to say that you wouldn't be entertaining those thoughts unless you already intended the outcome in which the thoughts are related

I'd suggest that it's better to side-step this because it implicitly suggests a deliberate causation that isn't necessarily so, plus a notion of an initial starting point which doesn't exist. If "awareness" is eternal, and all possible patterns exist eternally, then there is no time (in fact: *no time!*) where there wasn't a patterned awareness. In that context, saying that our experience (of "the world" or of "thoughts", the same really) is only because we intended the outcome is misleading, potentially. If we reserve "intention" to refer to our *deliberate* intensification of a pattern, we're on better ground, and our current state is a the sum of all intentions *and their implications* (their implications given that the intention is a modification of an existing state). These intentions may not be about outcome events as such, though. If you intend the experience of the image of an owl in front of you, then that is an intention (bringing into prominence the experience of "an owl image" and also the extended pattern of "owl") but it is not necessarily a selected outcome. You have shifted your state, but the results are not so clearly defined as having intended an event.

Intentions, then, can be really quite abstract, and not necessarily structured as events or objects or *world*-facts - that's why I use the concept of "patterns", since it does not assume a spatial or temporal aspect.

From here, we can loop back to the idea that because there is no division, because the "world-pattern" is continuous and undivided, then if there is any "world-fact" at all, then there is immediately, by implication, an entire world. That is, if the world-pattern was a metaphorical landscape, then as soon as there is anything other than uniformity, any slight hill or valley, then there is immediately a full topology. This is why we can't say that it is the sum of deliberate choices, but we can say that it is the (effective) sum of all intentions and implications, even if those intentions are not in the form of "choosing world-events or world-facts" or whatever.

> > If the above explanation has any weight, then intention is the cause of you letting go of another pattern, right?

So, if the world-experience is to be a self-consistent thing, then bringing one pattern into relative prominence will, simply from the property of a continuous pattern, mean that contradictory patterns will be relatively reduced. If you select "happiness" into prominence, then that is also a reduction in "depression".

You don't "detach" from anything, though. I think I know what you mean by "attaching" to a sensory experience, but for clarity it's better to say that you increase the prominence of a pattern, and that pattern implies a particular sensory experience, subsequently.

There's also a bit of exploration to be done in terms of what something like "depression" is. If the way we change our state is by, essentially, "leafing through" potential patterns by a sort of "associative browsing" of the eternal memory of all possible patterns, there's an interesting issue to ponder. That is, there's *perhaps* a difference between identifying and increasing or decreasing the pattern which is associated with the word or concept "depression" (following the word!), versus identifying the patterns associated with your actual experience, and increasing or decreasing *that* (following the direct feeling!). They may overlap, but it isn't necessarily the case. Because experience and intention are "direct' (that is, there is no intermediary), it's important to actually attend to *the pattern itself*, rather than just a proxy, or at least ensure the proxy *means-that* you are addressing the pattern itself.

Aside - I'd like to highlight here that none of this is an "explanation" in the sense of explaining "how things really work". The overall insight is that there *is* no "how things work", no mechanism or method. What it does instead, is propose a conceptual structure which is the minimum required for discussing a structured experience without specifying any particular instance of content. And then, it is also a structure which can be used to formulate intentions and conceive of their potential impact, while avoiding the associations usually implicit in more content-based descriptions (of which this is the "meta" perspective).

Reply to “Won $500 a few days ago”

Congrats on your win!

> I believe dimensionaljumping and law of attraction are essentially the same thing.

The usual philosophical follow-up questions: What "thing" is it, precisely, that both "dimensional jumping" and "the law of attraction" are? How does the law of attraction work, exactly, and what does this imply about the nature of our ongoing experience - and the nature of "the world" and "you"? Strictly speaking, without answering that we can't really say that "something triggered the win" nor that two things are the "same thing".

> Im guessing it was the feeling state that shifted me into an experience that matched the state?

It's potentially a way of looking at it. One possible model is that adopting a particular pattern (an image, a feeling, whatever) can trigger the associated extended pattern into prominence, and that this then informs your subsequent experience. Although we might wonder: what are "states" made from? And where are they? Or are they just metaphors which are used to formulate intentions, and which have no existence other than that?

The idea being, that the more clearly structured our description is, the more we move towards a situation where any apparent results can be linked back, and the outcome repeated (eventually ruling out coincidence or a tendency towards superstition). It's hard to pin down what, if anything, triggered the win here, I think, because there was a bit of a muddle of activities going on in this case. Did you get paid in $100 bills, for example, as in your visualisation? Or was there a more specific intention that accompanied the image? How would you go about repeating it - what have you learned from the experiment that you could reuse?

> I played the scratch offs for the sake of enjoying the game without caring if i won or lost.

Yeah, I do think the attitude of basically "being okay with whatever happens" is a key ingredient, even when it comes to managing and directing *everyday* life, never mind the more esoteric experiments.

> Perhaps the stability and relationship thing didn't come with her because I hadn't gotten to that part on my list yet before she came up and said hi

Ha, I love that. Following on from what you say about "yearning", I agree that does have an impact. We might draw the connection between this and "thinking *about*" vs "experience *of*". If you are thinking *about* something, imagining it in the 3rd person, then it is "over there" and you are "over here". There is a distance between it, and it is that distance, the gap between the desire and fulfilment, which leads to the yearning. For as long as the outcome is held in this 3rd-person state, then it cannot be experienced. For it to become an experience, one needs to be "clothed" by the outcome, it must be released from suspension "over there" and be allowed to dissolve into the main strand of experience "over here" - the 1st person. Basically, you must allow it to cease being a located, bounded thought, and become an unlocated, unbounded thought - because that is what ongoing experience is. To release something, then, is to allow it to dissolve into the background, and therefore become integrated into your main strand of 1st person experience. One might skip this, however, by formulating your intentions as "unlocated, unbounded" thoughts in the first place, rather than as object-type thoughts - provided one wasn't resisting change to the main strand at the same time.

Reply to “Did the cup method last week”

So, don't expect any particular "experience" at the time of performing the exercise. After all, unless your target outcome overlaps with this moment, there is no *necessary* sensory aspect to it at the moment of the exercise - we might say it becomes "true *now* that this happens *then*". Note that you don't have to do anything in terms of effort; literally follow the instructions as written.

Any outcomes will be noticed over the course of, say, a week. In this case, typically outcomes will apparently arise by "plausible, if very unlikely, routes". That is, they will not be directly "reality-breaking". Outcomes are not always the same as "results", too. And so:

Generally, treat this as an *experiment* - part of an *investigation*, into the nature of your ongoing experience - rather than a *method* (there are "philosophical" reasons for this). If you aren't having any results, you might consider choosing another target outcome to start with, and working your way through to your original idea later.

I'd tend to think a week is a good amount of time for "unlikely but plausible" events to appear, for most reasonable things. Treating this in the spirit of conducting an experiment on "the nature of experience", it makes sense to do the exercise and then give it a good amount of time to see results or effect - it's really down to personal judgement when you think an appropriate amount of time has passed. However: There's no inherent amount of time involved at all, though. At the moment of performing the exercise, it becomes "true *now* that this happens *then*", and the "then" could be *any* appropriate moment in the future. A bit like with the owls exercise, the intentional pattern (the experiential pattern of "the outcome event") will "shine through" an appropriate gap and context. Sometimes you will see the patterning crop up again unexpectedly, depending on how broad the target, how tightly defined its scenario or whatever.

Anyway, no need to bother about that: No harm in repeating now, I'd say.

> > it's fine to treat it as an experiment, but at some point you conclude the experiment worked or not. This is where the time frame comes in. You wouldn't do an experiment and think maybe 10 years later it will happen at the appropriate time, right? You would make a conclusion if the experiment worked or not?

Yep, hence suggesting waiting about a week. If other things arise later, then they can be taken on board at that time, but there's no benefit in waiting around for decades in anticipation of course! I mention it only because it's worth being aware, for when such an example crops up.

Reply to “It doesn't need to be with glasses..”

Definitely. Something to note, though: there is a difference between writing out a description, say, and actually linking objects (mental or physical) to particular situations or patterns. So no matter what the format, be sure to actually ponder your current and target states, and *let the words come from that contemplation*, rather than just writing out something or working out the words to use intellectually. That way, the words will be "handles" onto those *specific* states, rather than simply unattached words that will trigger a more general extended pattern.

(Although the Two Glasses instructions don't specify this explicitly, they are structured in such a way as to lead you to do this - provided you actually follow them and aren't tempted to interfere and analyse things during the performance of the exercise.)

> Lol it's fun watching you guys discover sigils.

It's even more fun watching people who are committed to sigils discover that it's all just *assigned meaning* and patterning within your own imagined perspective! ;-)

There's a benefit in having different angles on the same underlying approach. Sometimes things like "sigils" (and "servitors" and all that) have quite a bit of baggage associated with them, because they're still linked to a particular worldview or to a tradition with some contemporary decoration that no longer makes sense.

"Sigils" make a nice halfway house pattern between older ritual approaches and a more direct non-dual approach, but it would be a shame if anyone stopped and felt satisfied at that point, rather than pushing it that towards a more generalised pattern that connected to an understanding of "the nature of experience" more fully.

> Correct. However, one day you guys will realize that you're literally doing the chaos magic thing (which you, btw, just summed up very nicely) except in a more dogmatic way (though I think this post kinda points out that the dogma that permeates this sub is pointless... Yay milestones.)

No, it's a bit different to chaos magick, which I view as a bit of a failed experiment. Chaos magick had an idea - basically, the adoption of belief as a method for structuring experience - but because it never really worked out what a "belief" was, nor had a "meta-metaphor" for managing and directing it, it never really went anywhere. It's basically dead now.

The underlying concept here isn't really that you are "jumping dimensions" of course; that's just a formatting metaphor. The real point is to be able to directly observe and utilise a *formatless* platform, and then knowingly engage in "the patterning of experience" (for example) via intention and implication. The more important thing, though, is to ask *how or why* that can work, right?

> [Q: Yup accepting a new truth/reality/dimension through use of "assigned meaning techniques" or whatever is different from causing a paradigm shift through a "magic ritual".
>
> /s
>
> You clearly have some kind of baggage/hang up about the occult. I'm sorry, but the main thing with chaos magic is the idea that you can do magic without a set dogma (basically, whatever works for you

> is good. Or "nothing is true, everything is permitted".) if you think this "dimensional jumping" is anything but another way to preform practical magic, you're misinformed...]

Sigh. Save me the sarcasm, eh? It gets us nowhere.

Definitely, "dimensional jumping" in the broader sense is as different to ritual magick as ritual magick is to having your arm move. That is to say, there is no difference in their nature at all. There's not much point in arguing in that area: before we know it, we'll end up retorting "oh, but that's just a movement of consciousness" to everything.

For sure, chaos magick had the idea that "whatever works for you is good" - and that's a nice principle to bear in mind - but then got stuck because that's not really an idea at all. It has no content. It never went anywhere as an approach, because there's no substance to that statement.

I don't *really* have a hangup about "the occult" - hey, it was fun times - other than that the categorising of some things as "occult" and "magick" tends to makes them seem distinct from mundane ongoing experience, something special that requires "techniques". For example, if every assigned meaning is effectively a reshaping of experience, then labelling some as "sigils" and not others, without digging any deeper, isn't helpful or insightful. It stops the exploration dead for many people.

> > All magic is based on self hypnosis and assigned/reassigned meaning.

First, we should probably broaden it out and say that: ***"all* experiential content is based on assigned or implied meaning."**

But then: *how*, though? How does that work? What does "self hypnosis" even mean? What and where is this "self"? It's not even clear that such a thing actually exists, other than as a container concept. Without a metaphysics - a base formatting - that doesn't really help us at all. It doesn't have any meaning, assigned or otherwise.

> [Q2: I agree with the need for some sort of metaphysics or belief system. If you think you're free/above such things then you are deluding yourself. A teacher of mine once told the story of a friend who built a device to erase all of his beliefs. After using it, he died a few days later of multiple exotic diseases. Perhaps he no container left to protect him? If you subscribe to the Judeo-Christian metaphysics, then you have angels and demons; you are under their authority. If you subscribe to some other metaphysics at the deepest psychic level, then those are your rules for morality and magic. I'm still examining my own through introspective meditation.]

Agreed. People sometimes get into these things thinking that if they could just delete their limitations, everything would be great. What would happen instead is, they'd destabilise the structure they had in place, getting some unlovely side-effects, or end up with something more like a strand of associative thought rather than "a world".

It's good to be aware of your current structure, but I tend to feel the focus needs to be on shifting to a metaphysics or "formatting" that is cleaner (maybe somewhat "diagrammatic" rather than symbolic), rather than *just* dismantling something.

The term "beliefs" can be part of the problem, I find. It's not always clear with that whether someone is referring to the formatting of their main ongoing experience ("the world"), or a strand of thought *about* their

experience. The boundary is not a simple one, but focusing on the latter while thinking one is addressing the former can lead to issues. Descriptions can never really capture this, of course; as you suggest, our "own ... introspective meditation" is how we make progress with this stuff.

[...]

> Also... We know it's assigned meaning? That's kindof literally how it works...?

So - **how, *exactly*, does that work, literally?** How does one assign meaning to something, and why should assigning meaning accomplish anything? Without a descriptive framework for that, we're left sort of hand-waving the topic, rather than being able to deliberately construct outcomes via actions.

Reply to “Letting go”

So, it's perhaps useful to see that "letting go" isn't something you actually *do* - although language tends to imply that. There's no technique. If you look for a method, you'll end up doing something else instead but calling it "letting go".

First, I'd think of it more like a *not interfering* after having intended an outcome. The idea being that when you have made a change, then it becomes "true *now* that this happens *then*" and any further tinkering amounts to counter-intending. That's why the final instruction of the *Two Glasses* exercise is as it is.

Second, there's "letting go" in the sense of non-attachment. Now, sometimes people say "detachment" but I feel that can get us muddled up with the idea of trying to be separate from what's happening somehow, which would actually be a sort of interfering or holding - the opposite of what you want. "Non-attachment", then, would correspond to allowing the ongoing moment to unfold without obstruction no matter what its content - as above - but *also* means not trying to "make" things happen when intending. Intention has no inherent sensory component, after all - sensory experiences are always "results". Attempts to force or manipulate experience in order to "experience doing the intending" is basically an intention to create a particular sensation, and if that sensation is associated with your current state, you are effectively re-intending that instead of your target outcome.

Generally, it is probably useful to conceive of your current patterned state as the full definition of your world. That "world-pattern" consists of all the current active facts, and therefore fully determines the sequence of sensory moments that will follow. And so, if you successfully shift this via a "jump", then from that point onwards the new target fact has been incorporated and taken into account - even if you have experiences which aren't filled with joy or whatever afterwards, or passing doubtful thoughts or whatever (simply leave those alone). For sure, you *might* experience synchronicities afterwards, just as a side effect of "patterning" your experience, but there is no reason why you must experience any indications of success prior to experiencing that actual outcome. Basically, this isn't a "signs form the universe" type deal. (In fact, in this view, there *is* no independent "universe" as we usually conceive of it.) "Letting go", then, becomes somewhat a matter of trust, acceptance, belief, faith and so on - but only in the sense that those tend to lead to you not interfering; they are not in and of themselves a cause of results.

[...]

Decide to have a clean slate, and begin your experiment again.

You can also play with carrying this over into everyday life: for example, lots of people move their bodies by straining and controlling their muscles, instead of, say, intending an outcome then allowing their body movements to arise spontaneously. After all, "body movement" is another experience like any other, the nature of it and its relationship to intention is identical, so that's a good way to practice.

For example, sit down in a chair and then *intend* to be standing up - or to be standing over there by the door, whatever - but don't *do* anything about it, *nor* obstruct any movements that arise. By doing this you'll become aware of whether you are, for instance, habitually intending your current position and then having to strain to overcome it, or whether you are intending muscle tension (for "doing") as well as the outcome. (Which

would be like intending "stay still" and "move freely" simultaneously, producing the experience of effort and strain.)

One might consider, then, that to intend these unhelpful ways is actually to regularly re-intend your current state, in preference to your target state. "Resistance" to change isn't necessarily about fighting back in obvious ways; it can be more like returning to an overall extended or postural pattern by unwittingly re-intending a part of it. (I don't mean to overstate this though: you are not undoing all your good intentions every time you struggle to get out of a chair!)

Don't get too hung up on that last bit though; there's nothing to be done about them, it's more about recognising the benefit of, and experimenting with, "ceasing to interfere" and allowing the moments between now and the outcome to unfold without obstructing.

[...]

Experiences like that do quite efficiently break the illusion that there is something "behind" experience - that there is an "out there" where things are happening, eh?

Essentially, that's what the demo exercises (owls of eternity and two glasses) are intended to illustrate, by providing an initial encounter which raises doubts regarding our assumptions about the nature of experiencing (and of descriptions about experiencing), as well as a framework for more adventurous experiments subsequently.

Yes, when you work through it, it's actually the most comforting state of affairs there could be.

It takes a while, though, to take care of initial concerns - like worrying you are "the only person" and so on (eventually you realise that there only being *you-as-awareness* is quite a different proposition to there only being *you-as-person*). And having the direct experience removes the concern that this view involves a sort of "dead" world; actually it means that the world, as a pattern, is "made from" the only "aliveness" there is.

I also think we tend to shift from stuckness to stuckness, before we adopt the meta perspective that all experiential *content* (or patterning) is on the same "level", with no view being primary. It's the context of *all* experiences that is what is fundamental (the fact of "experiencing" at all), and recognising that is what frees us. Hence all that "you are the non-material material whose only property is *being-aware* and which 'takes on the shape of' states and experiences" type stuff, in an attempt to highlight and point to that context versus content.

[...]

Yeah, I sometimes think viewing things in programming terms - or other mechanistic analogies - can be a hurdle, perhaps, because it tends to imply that there are processes and mechanisms whereby one thing operates on another, which is not the case when we are talking about the *nature* experience (whether that is unobstructed experience or intentional shifting) rather than its *content*.

(Further thoughts:)

I do keep returning to a model whereby we have *ourselves-as-world* as a single patterned landscape which *self-shifts*, and is static in between such shifts. The only thing that "happens", then, is intention - and that is not a process nor does it have a mechanism. Your ongoing "unfolding moment" *appears* to be changing, happening,

but really it is static from an overall perspective (we could say that "time passing" is a static pattern in our landscape).

Which is why you can't *do* anything in order to be non-attached [1], because any attempt to do so is actually an intention, a deformation or obstruction of the situation which was *already* there, an example of interference we are supposedly trying to avoid! Actually, I suppose part of the problem with getting a handle on this is that people assume that in their daily lives they are always "doing" their movements and thoughts and so on, and this means they just don't have the concept of experience just happening "by itself". But if you pay attention to your everyday life, you'll find that this is very much what happens (and that's why doing silly little experiments with body movement can be quite helpful, to dispel incorrect assumptions).

[1] Again, I used "non-attached" instead of "detached" there to emphasise that there is no attempt to somehow separate ourselves from experience involved. That's what "detached" seems to imply for some people, even though it is *meant* to indicate detachment in the sense of "being okay with and non-resistant to whatever arises", rather than putting distance between the (apparent, supposed) experiencer and their experience. Having said that, I do tend to use those terms somewhat interchangeably myself.

Reply to “Question about Letting Go”

There is no 'technique' really, other than allowing the current "world-thought" to fade and then *thinking-to* the desired thought. In terms of 'letting go' you should approach it as more of a *playing dead*. Just totally give up and surrender to the universe, god, the flow of all things - release all control and let your self be moved however things move you. This allows the world-pattern to shift freely. *Then* you 'think replacement facts' - which are always incorporated into the world, but now the flow towards experiencing them becomes smooth.

Basically: you need to be comfortable with feeling completely out of control (things move by themselves) in order to have pure influence. *From elsewhere:*

All Thoughts Are Facts

On using the *world-as-thought* perspective as a way to create deliberate synchronicity and therefore particular scenes:

- You are an "open conscious space" in which thoughts arise. The apparent world is basically a very bright, stable, full 3D-sensory immersive strand of thought.
- The world evolves by the accumulation of observations or "facts".
- Every thought you have about the world is *literally* adding a new fact to the world.
- Thoughts which randomly arise simply reveal the current state of the world.
- If you deliberately think a thought, then you are deliberately adding a new fact to the world. (This is how to make changes.)
- The more intense the thought, the stronger the influence of that “fact” upon your experience.
- If you respond emotionally to a random thought, then you are in effect re-thinking it as a more intense thought, meaning it will contribute more. (Hence fearful thoughts tend to increase the prevalence of fear-related experiences; however this works just as well for nice-emotion thoughts.)
- If you “grasp” onto a thought then you are persisting it - you are maintaining it at its present level of intensity and not letting it fade and be “forgotten”.

Things such as detachment, surrender, abandoning yourself, and so on, are all about letting the current dominant thoughts or “facts” become softer and fade, letting the world shift freely, and allowing other thoughts to shift into prominence.

[...]

On Surrender

> Would that be like ego death?

Not really - well, if you are holding onto a part of experience that you are calling "you" then I suppose so. But it's more akin to just not continuing to assert any state and being okay with any movement or change that arises. (This is where "faith" comes in for older traditions, I suppose: the faith that your intentions have been incorporated even if you can't see it yet.)

That's why I'm a big fan of every day lying *on the floor* in the constructive rest position (feet flat, knees up, books supporting head) and totally giving up your existence to, say, gravity - letting your body, thoughts and (this is key) attentional focus shifts as they want. (See *Just Decide* and *Overwriting Yourself* for related ideas.)

Something to ponder: What is the ego? What is a mind? We conceive of them as things or containers, but we cannot find them because they are just concepts. If you get into the habit of never "believing" the thoughts that appear - they are just passing sensory aspects of the present state - then it's not a problem I think?

On State Change

> The experience was very profound. Though I chased it, I couldn't find that state, and I don't recall finding it since.

Sounds quite dramatic! :-)

Yeah, it can't be chased because the key to it is that you have released a hold on your attention. By trying to get it, we end up narrowing our focus - which of course works against the *open* (or non-existence) focus that *is* the signature property of that state. Attention *deforms* space and maintains an artificial shape. If you're paddling about in a pond, you won't discover a transparent surface by splashing harder.

> My recent cluster of synchronicity didn't require anywhere near that level of detachment.

Every thought is a fact, and increasing the intensity of a thought always increases its contribution. It *always* has an effect. Synchronicity is the rule.

What detaching does is allow the shift to happen quicker and cleaner. Restricting movement slows appearance - like tensing your arm while trying to move it. The movement *will* happen in some form, but it is being inhibited.

Example - being sat down and then standing up. The way to do this is to thinking of the state "being stood up" and let it happen. Most people, however, begin by re-asserting the state "being sat down" and even worse the intermediate states of "getting up". Let go of all that; simply assert "being stood up" and the world will shift to that state "all by itself". (This is a nice simple experiment everyone can try. There is *no difference* between shifting your world to a "standing up" state and shifting it to any other state.)

On Words & Dreams

> Is what I described similar to what you intended to say?

Same stuff, different words! :-) A final thought: experiences are always just experiences. We never discover how things really work by exploring more content, it's always just... *more dream*.

Of course, these are just my thoughts based on my own observations; you'll find your own way of describing things and what works for you, which other people will then find clarifies it for them, and so on.

Further thoughts to finish off...

What you said in the other comment - cleaning vs feeding - is appropriate. Meditation might calm you to your rest state or focus you into space, or give you temporary respite, but it takes a long time for the rest state to change. Faith means being willing to take the jump (so to speak) and *assert* yourself as the larger conscious space and *assert* it as clear.

Detachment means to cease re-triggering your current habit ("stop thinking of being-sat-down") so that you can assert the desired replacement ("think of being-stood-up") without opposition or conflict. That's what the active-assertive version of *Overwriting Yourself* is about, if you fancy experimenting with this.

There's nothing very complicated about it all really - in terms of understanding the nature of it - but it's sneaky in that it bends and changes to reflect how you think about it:

"However you imagine that it works, That's how it works." -- The rule of metaphor

Which is actually the whole basis of "active metaphors" and this subreddit. You are literally living in and as a metaphor, where meaning and facts can be *asserted* explicitly or implicitly.

[...]

> I fell asleep when I completely let go of everything

It might take a while because you are not used to being in an open state; letting go implies sleep and you follow through. Don't worry about it.

Allowing Standing: Inserting Future Moments

> But as soon I sayed "Get up" in my head it implied to me I've layed down and so it didn't work

Remember that you are not meant to be directly causing the movement: Getting up won't happen immediately upon command necessarily - particularly when you've build up a strong "being fixed in position" concept as most people have (continually re-asserting their body to keep it in place). You must be careful to realise you are not meant to be *doing* or *causing* standing up at all. All that's required is that you *decide* that you are going to get up. And then do nothing. Eventually it will just happen by itself.

The *thought-decision* doesn't directly correspond to the standing up, it is indirect. Rather, it "inserts that pattern or state" into your experience: Think of the next 20 minutes as being a strip of film, each frame of which is your "experiential state" at that moment. By creating the thought of "being stood up" you are *inserting or modifying a future frame* of the film. When you get to that frame, the experience of standing up will happen "by itself", just as the movement of characters of a film "happens by itself". Intentions apply to *the whole screenplay* even though within the "screen" of your conscious mind-space only a single frame of the corresponding movie is visible.

I've probably not explained that very well. Basically, this is an "ask and receive" or "command and response" type situation. There is a little trick you might try, though:

Standing & Catching: Withdrawing Presence

Sit down on a chair, and rest your attention upon your forehead or slightly behind - withdraw your "presence" from the rest of your body and centre on that spot. This is a way to help stop re-asserting your current body state, to stop "staying still while trying to move". So, do that and then "just decide" to stand up or think "standing up", and let your body move by itself whenever it wants to.

This is also the 'magic' technique for catching objects. Centre there and have a friend throw things at you, and allow your body to catch them spontaneously. Eventually (once you've done the giving-up thing enough) you won't need to do the centring trick because your "held position" thought will have faded.

If you like you can do the *active-assertive* approach and summon the experience of being open space more directly, as described in the link in that comment.

The reflexes thing is crazy eh? It's almost quite scary the first times you play with it - it's like being in ultimate control by completely giving up control.

On the overwriting thing, to clarify, it's based on the realisation that your experience right now is *literally* imagination floating in conscious space and you *are* that space. So, right now, close your eyes and mentally "feel out" into the space in front of you, behind you, below you, above you - and realise that you can feel out "forever". Furthermore, notice that all that your body is, is a bunch of sensations floating in space. You never actually experience something that corresponds to your idea of your body (a solid thing that lumbers around), although you've probably adopted behaviours *as if* that were true.

Having realised this, the extra bit is that you can *assert* or *reimagine* the content of that space directly, or imply it by "just deciding" or issuing a command or whatever. Anything which triggers the corresponding state. The first port of call is to get rid of all those accumulated tensions and emotional content and so on, by allowing it to release or be replaced. From there, it's about producing desired change - essentially, imagining things and attaching *meaning* to those things, thus creating corresponding effects.

Yeah, as you can see, it's very hard to describe but it really is pretty simple to experience. Realising the difference between *thinking-about* and *direct-experiencing* is a real key to all this.

The core is: your actions have always been indirect, you have never "done" anything; all you have ever been doing is intending experiences, including the experience of "doing something".

It's natural to feel a bit of fear, because you still feel separate to your surroundings.

Checking out the books and exploring is definitely a good approach. It's an enjoyable process - and you'll find even just closing your eyes and feeling the vast space is very pleasant, and it's always available! (You might feel a bit vulnerable and "exposed" initially, but that's just acclimatisation.)

[...]

So long as people don't think in terms of synchronicity being "the outside world" coming back at them (which is when people start worrying about "messages" or having "a path" that is independent of them), then it's all good. It's literally like pondering a topic for a while, and then having more thoughts about the topic pop up later. Once you realise that both "the world" and "my thoughts" appear in the same mind-space, it stops being so mysterious. I'm more of an owls man myself, and let me tell you they get everywhere. The Owls Of Eternity™ are, once summoned, companions for life.

Hmm. Thinking about it: if life is indeed like a dream, then a tranquilizer gun is the ideal weapon...

Reply to “Thoughts becoming actions”

It's how things work anyway, and it applies to everything. I'm going to have a bash at expanding on that (just as an excuse to riff on the topic): Until now, you have been moving your body by trying to "grip the sensations" while intending the arm to move. This is like commanding yourself to stay still *and* move at the same time - i.e. asserting you current position at the same time as asserting a new position.

Instead, while meditating, you imagined (asserted) just the movement while not asserting you current position to the same extent - therefore allowing experience to shift towards it. If you really ceased asserting your current position more completely, I suggest the movement would have been more immediate - simply bringing the movement to mind would have resulted in a shift towards that position.

The relationship between this and "jumping"?

Well, your body is as much the environment as anything else. There is no difference between the process of changing your *body's position* and change your *world's position*.

In truth, you do not actually move your arm directly at all! What you do is you "assert the fact" of your arm being in the air, at which moment the *facts-of-the-world* are immediately updated (perhaps with a time component), after which your experiences arise constantly with that new fact. This is exactly the same thing that happens with updating any other fact.

The essence of this:

- **THE FORMULA** - *Act + Intention + Detachment = Shift*
- Any "act", mental or physical, means what you have decided that it means, knowingly or unknowingly. This is the "intention", a subtle thought pattern that is a shadow of the desired end-state. (The "act" can be a thought, a physical movement, anything.)
- Your experience unfolds in accordance with the sum of these "intentions". (Meanwhile, the less you are continually re-intending your current state, the more time-efficient the shift to the target state will be.)

So maybe we can categorise things a bit:

- *Usual Movements* - If you grip your arm mentally (with the implicit intention that this means your arm will move), then the gripping is the act, but unfortunately it also opposes the movement to some extent (as well as generating tension).
- *Efficient Movements* - If you imagine your arm moving (with the implicit intention that this means that your arm will move), then the imagining is the act. You are going straight for the end-state here, and letting your experience shift freely, so there's no conflict.
- *World Movements* - If you pour a glass of water (with the implicit intention that this means a fact of the world will change), or imagine a scene vividly (with the implicit intention), either will result in a shift. A result is guaranteed, however its level of contribution to your experience depends on detachment and your intentions so far.

This is where the phrase "The Act is The Fact" comes from, suggesting that all acts are arbitrary and their meanings are flexible:

- **RULE 1A** - *Assigning a meaning to an act is what gives it causal power.*

Note also that the assignment of meaning accumulates (that's why you live in an apparently stable world) and can be broadened beyond deliberate acts. You can play with things like "the next time I see a red car, it *means-that* I will have a great day". And what is an act, other than the *experience of* an act?

So the more generalised version of this is:

- **RULE 1B** - *Assigning a meaning to an experience gives it causal power.*

[[Q: Lots of interesting things to think about as always. As a sidenote, I have tried the glasses trick twice, the first time earlier this month as a test, with 'single' and 'girlfriend' as the subject. I chose this mainly because it would be the easiest thing I thought to see a change in, not because I was desperate for a girlfriend. When I did it, I did actually feel a shift, although I haven't seen any overtly massive changes since.

The second test, last week, was 'low attention span' and 'complete focus', I didn't feel a shift at the time, but last Tuesday night, I felt a complete shift away from heavily valuing inherently useless acts and suddenly became overtly motivated to improve myself, and since then have felt extremely liberated and with a sense of peace and calm. Maybe I meant 'complete focus' in a different way that I intended?

And finally, I just tried the mirror technique, and saw all of the somewhat creepy faces (which didn't really startle me, a lot of asian-looking demons I think due to my weird triangle eyebrows) and my head dissolve to blackness, but the second I moved my eyes, it was back to normal, and I felt no shift. So, I'll try again later.]]

The "complete focus" one is interesting.

Related perhaps: often we tend to assume that being "focused" towards a goal means "concentrating" - i.e. narrowing our attention. But actually, such a narrowing of your attention just deforms your experience and builds stress, opposing movement and preventing change. It's like the thing of trying to stand up while holding onto *being-sat-down*. It's better, I think, to consider "focus" as *intentional focus", meaning that you have an intention and you don't interfere with it. There's no effort involved in this.

So I'd consider "feeling liberated with a sense of peace and calm" to be very much a symptom of being focused in the intentional sense: wide-open attention, clarity, effortlessness, clear direction.

As to the mirror technique, I'm not a fan particularly. I'd be more inclined to do the equivalent of your meditation-arm-movement - get into a relaxed state and summon imagery which *means-that* your desired state will be activated into your experience. It's fun to play with all approaches though, and see what works best for you.

[...]

So, I'll start off by saying there is no "creative intelligence" other than you, and nothing ever "happens" other than the movement of your attention.

For simplicity let's think of the world as a 3D landscape (a current overall pattern), and your unfolding experience is like your attention traversing that landscape, section by section.

Okay, so how is this landscape formed?

Pattern by pattern. Think of each intention as triggering a new pattern across the whole landscape, such that it is added to the current world, to form a resultant pattern which is novel (note: *negative* patterns can undo the contribution of positive ones). So we have something like this picture of Moire fringes.



With that model in place, let's apply the following interpretation:

- Each pattern corresponds to a *fact-of-the-world*.

And let's have some facts, which were created implicitly through combinations of previous patterns leading to the current landscape:

- (General:) "SP is a good person who finds happiness from friendship. All those friends live in SP's city."
- (General:) "SP is an ambitious person who wants success."
- (General:) "Events tend to unfold such that SP will be happier overall."
- (Event:) "SP's company is diversifying globally and will open an new branch in Alaska in June 2016."
- (Event:) "Another company suited to SP's skills will open in SP's city in October 2016 with great opportunities for experienced talent."

All of these can be "subconscious" in the sense that they have not been experienced as expanded into the senses yet, but they are all true at this moment. But let's say you have previously explicitly thought about your ambition, but not the friendship aspect.

So how does this play out?

If you were completely non-attached and allowed experience to simply flow, then in June 2016 would hear about the Alaskan branch, circumstances would be such that you either didn't go for the promotion or didn't get it, you'd hear about the new company in October 2016, get a job there and be very successful and love life with all your friends.

If instead you hear about the Alaskan branch in 2016 and try to push yourself towards that because you have already though about ambition, you will feel yourself intending in that direction against the momentum of the pattern, you may even encounter lots of "signs" about not doing it, nagging thoughts and feelings, events

arising as hurdles, but you ignore it and push through. You spend the rest of your days in an icy landscape, the boss of the branch but all alone.

In no case is there an "intelligence" operating behind the scenes. It's simply a case of a patterned landscape being set up with biases in certain directions, and you later intending against it and experiencing the results of that. It is equally possible to have a "subconscious" which is setup *against* you and leads you to self-destruction (although most people have a default "survival pattern" I would say).

[...]

Just to preamble:

Fundamentally Wrong, Relatively Right

> In my limited understanding of your model...

We have to be a little careful here, because (of course) every model we use is a metaphor, not the actual situation. To think about something, we necessarily have to cut it into parts, and then relate those parts in space, because our thinking is basically a "shadow-sensory experience". In this discussion we are talking about *the thing that even thoughts are made of*, it is "before" division and relation, before "space" and "time". In other words:

- As soon as we talk about *this-thing* and *that-thing* interacting, we are already wrong in a fundamental sense, but we can be right in a relative sense.

This is why we tend to end up with a few metaphors, each of which might seem to slightly conflict in terms of how it chops things up, but capture a different slice of meaning, if that makes sense. They are judged on their usefulness, rather than their correctness.

Okay, with that out of the way:

One Thing, Many Patterns, Varying Contributions

> you immediately get the thing (and a cascade of its related patterns) but the "landing site" on the landscape may be closer or further away from the spotlight.

That's a really nice way to put it, yes. Inevitably, I'll expand a bit on it...

Another way to think about things is: in the daytime sky, all the stars are there, at their usual brightness, however one star (the sun) dominates them with its intensity.

Right now, you are literally experiencing all possible patterns. All that changes is their level of contribution to your experience. The combination is what's giving you the form of this present moment. As some of the patterns fade, their contribution becomes less, and the total pattern *apparently* shifts into a new form. Like the Moire fringes I linked to above. The fading of one pattern is the equivalent to a pattern moving across another in Moire fringes.

A nice way to imagine this is as a stack of transparent projector slides, each with a different pattern. *But rather than a light shining through, each slide has its own inherent glow; it is self-illuminating*. You can turn up or down the intensity of the contribution of each pattern to the overall stack. Each slide corresponds to a particular formatting or "fact" and some of them can be quite abstract facts.

For instance, one "fact" might be the pattern called "time". That activation of that pattern will then structure the the total experience as if there was a sequence. Another "fact" might be pattern called "distance". Another, "colour", and so on. This means:

- The "gloop" and your "experience" are actually the same thing - and that "dark zone" is present too, at all times, since it is just our name for the more prominent contributing patterns.

In normal life, we have what you might call a "passing time" pattern. This is a static pattern, but it has the *effect* of producing the movement and change effect that the video above showed.

Since what we truly are *is* the stuff all this is made of - the infinite gloop *is us* - we can also intentionally shift the levels of contribution, and thereby pick out and adjust things we might call "the future" or "the past", and indeed adjust anything that might be called a "fact", either a general principle or a specific event. We can select a particular slide and modify the extent to which that is going to be a fact in our world, in effect swap one fact for another, and so on.

So, I'm not sure how clear that was, but you can see that fundamentally there is no particular structure. And even given the total pattern (distribution of contributions) you are experiencing right now, there are many ways we can slice that up conceptually when we are thinking about it. This is why we can say that the world-pattern is both static and eternal *and* moving and temporary, and so on.

> Either this is the ultimate AnswerToTheLifeTheUniverseAndEverything or some top-secret viral mind-screwing meme you're developing and weaponizing for MI5

Why not both? ;-)

Okay, so this is much harder to describe than to actually play with. The main purpose of the "patterning" model is to break free of the idea of the world being "really like" your sensory experience, in such a way that it makes sense that you can use your imagination to make change, and assign meaning to acts, and have results "as if" there was a world out there that was being updated by them. But really this is philosophy and metaphysics and you don't need to understand anything in order to use the conclusions, it just means you can answer questions about "why do this and not that?" and don't end up talking hand-waving new-age vagueness.

> So, if I can control the dials of this cool Reality Mixing Console, what prevented me ("after" all this "eternity") from pumping up all the pleasurable patterns and turning down all the painful ones?

You've probably noticed already that pleasure is temporary, because experiential content is relative and changes. Pleasure and pain, I suggest, arise from how things are separated, the tension between one state and another when you resist the shifting of your world, not their content as such. The only way you can have eternal bliss is by dissolving all division, and therefore all content. But then, after a while, you probably have a thought and the whole thing kicks off again. (You can, however, *feel contentment* all the time, but that's a bit different.)

There's also that thing of: if you knew it was "all a dream", then you wouldn't mind so much what suffering happened in your adventures, because it would "all turn out alright in the end".

> The classic "simple but not easy", to the extreme...

Well, it's "the thing", this, isn't it?

So, practically speaking, have you had the experience of being an "open aware space" yet? That's the first thing to go for. What we're after is to build the bridge between *thinking-about* and *direct-knowing*. After that, it becomes more obvious how things work.

[...]

I mean the experience that you are "the unbounded container in which experiences arise", which includes the felt-location (typically a spot behind the eyes) that we sometimes call "me" and, never examining it properly, misidentify ourselves with.

Harding: I think his Pointing Exercise is a nice quick way to recognise there are "gaps" in your perceptual field, but other than that I don't think he really explains this well. But the thing it eventually that leads to is the thing I'm talking about. After all, it even makes logical sense even if you believe in the "brains receiving sensory input" description - you *still* get to the result that *this*, right now, is all made from mind or "consciousness", and that's all you ever actually experience.

> Intellectually I get it, but I cannot perceive myself as an unbounded space...

I definitely recognise the difficulty in crossing the boundary between *thinking-about* this, and *direct-knowing* of this. And it's very difficult to put into words. That's actually an issue: that you have to start imagining that you are open space, in order to fully have the experience of being open space. Also, people want to somehow "stand outside of experience" to see how it is. But there *is* no outside to experience. And if you ever have an apparent "outside of experience" experience - then that'll just be another experience, *inside* experience. (See OOBEs, later.)

> ...because the tactile feelings from the surface of my (physical or simulated or dreamed) body are too convincing.

But a moment's pause reveals that you are not inside those sensations, right? Close you eyes, listen to the sounds in the room and beyond. Where are those sounds? Where are "you"? Are you "over here" and those sounds "over there"? Or are you "over there" *as well?* And when you reach out with your *feeling* or *presence*, don't you discover that you can *feel out* forever in all directions?

There's the sensation in the head area which you might have habitually called "me" - but it obviously isn't, because you experience outside of that. It's just a particular bit of experience you've got in the habit of calling "me". Stop thinking, just pay attention: your "awareness" is everywhere, and that's what you really are, rather than any one part of the *content* of experience.

> Are there legal ways to break free from the meat bag?

The problem is, you're *already* free of it, because there's kinda no such thing. You are just *thinking* that you are in one.

You might experiment with out-of-body experiences (look up the "rope technique"), but in my experience people tend to think they "left their body" rather than recognising that they are never *in* a body, so they still end up having to do some direct investigation and experimentation.

Tricky business, but it *is* worth persisting.

EDIT: Something which might help: you could view this as conclusion which is arrived at by **inferring** that you are an "imagination space"; you never experience being one, as such. If you were a shape-shifter, but didn't know it, how would you discover that for yourself? How would you confirm it? There is no one fundamental shape that would mean you were a shape-shifter; it would be the fact of multiple relative shapes arising by intention.

> This seems to work a bit. The effects are fleeting, but it's a start.

Just do this regularly, in particular include sounds that are behind you, and then try to "feel the space" around about those sounds. Similarly, with eyes closed, notice the sensations of (say) your feet touching the ground, your hands against an object, and notice the feeling of space around them too. The "over here" aspect will probably turn out to be a particular, subtle sensation floating in space, in your "head area". Out of habit, you assume *that* sensation is you, whereas other sensation (sound, texture, visual - *world*) are "over there" and not-you. But you'll discover that *what-you-are* is actually everywhere, unbounded, forever.

The more you do this, the clearer it'll become and... the nicer everything will feel, just going about your day.

> So, why create the body/"me" illusions?

Well, there is no "why", there is only how, perhaps.

Have you ever had any hypnagogic imagery as you go to sleep? If you remain aware during it, you find that sparkles appear, which turn to shapes, which turn to fragments, which turn to images, which eventually become a scene, which then snaps into a 3D-immersive environment - i.e. *a world*.

I'd say the body is a matter of inference - some observations arose which *implied* the existence of a perspective; other observations arose of object which *implied* that you were an object. Autocompletion of patterning happened, basically.

If you adopt the idea that what you truly are is *a world*, which is being experienced *from a particular perspective*, then that is quite useful for loosening your identity, I'd say.

> I once had a spontaneous OOBE, but ("etheric") body feelings were present anyway...

Yeah, habits die hard. Perhaps even at the point of death...

Possibly the most interesting experience it "the void", where there is nothing at all, you simple "are". We might consider that to be the *content-free* state, just *being-knowing*. (Well, all content is always present, but in this case none of it is "activated" or contributing to experience.)

That's why lucid dreaming is a big help for exploring the nature of experience, I'd say: you can pursue all those sorts of experience, and notice that "you" persist even when all apparent signs of object-existence disappears.

[...]

> but I knew what I meant.

That's all that matters. This isn't a message to some external "entity god"; we're not making requests of Father Christmas. The words are just a way to capture the essence of the idea you have in mind, create a form for it temporarily so that you can work with it. There is nothing external to you, "doing" anything. This is a "dumb" process: the moment you perform the act is the moment the update happens - it's just that you encounter what you've done later, like an architect exploring a building they have designed, seeing the finished product for the first time.

In case it's useful, when I first started the "spontaneous movement" thing, in my mind I thought of the initial step as deciding to "cease" or "stop generating", such that I was in what I thought of as my current "rest state". From there, since I was not intending any particular state, I could just create an *imaginary cause* and have it move my body.

> Which I know is a paradox, but oh well.

Yeah, well, you might as well get used to that! :-)

Just a thought: remember, for this particular stuff you don't need to "visually-visualise"; you can just "feel-visualise". This is easy because it's actually what you use to direct your body anyway, even though you might be also gripping and manipulating in other ways. (If you weren't doing this, by which I mean the "feel", you would never be able to change state in terms of body position.) For instance, expanding "the feeling of you" into the room around you, including your body space, is usually pretty fulfilling (excuse pun), and good practice for everything else.

It's quite fun and exciting, isn't it?

Something else to do. For everyday living, it's nice to be open and spacious, but expanding out can imply some level of maintenance and an edge. So, imagine for a moment that there is *already* a background space which is infinite in all directions and passes through everything in all directions, and that this is the "openness" in which all experiences arise. Any one point is instantly the whole thing, in a similar way to how, if you put a drop of special purple dye into a pool of water, the water would immediately be purple. "Purple" would be everywhere. That's what this unbounded space is: the context, everywhere. To be part of this space, is to instantly become the whole of this space.

Now, *just decide* to be that background space.

[...]

I don't know what your approach is, but I'd point out that for visualising you don't need to "draw the image" or use any effort, just in case you find yourself doing those things. Instead, you lightly "assert the fact" that something is there, and let the sensory aspect arise associatively, by implication. (The "Imagining That" section of this post was an attempt to convey this.)

Imagining That

When we talk of imagination and imagining something, we tend to think about a maintained ongoing visual or sensory experience. We are *imagining* a red car, we are *imagining* a tree in the forest.

However, imagination is not so direct as that, and to conceive of it incorrectly is to present a barrier to success - and to the understanding that **imagining and imagination is *all that there is*.**

We don't actually imagine in the sense of maintaining a visual, rather we "imagine *that*". We imagine *that* there is a red car and we are looking at it; we imagine that *there* is a tree in the forest and we can see it. In other words, *we imagine or 'assert' that something is true* - and the corresponding sensory experience follows.

We in effect *recall* the details into existence.

It is in this sense that we imagine being a person in a world. You are currently imagining *that* you are a human, on a chair, in a room, on a planet, reading some text. We imagine *facts* and the corresponding experience follows, even if the fact itself is not directly perceived. Having imagined *that there is* a moon, the tides still *seem to* affect the shore even if it is a cloudy sky. And having imagined a fact thoroughly, having imagined that it is an *eternal* fact, your ongoing sensory experience will remain consistent with it forever. Until you decide that it isn't eternal after all.

Exercise: When attempting to visualise something, instead of trying to make the colours and textures vivid, try instead to fully accept the fact of its existence, and let the sensory experience follow spontaneously.

Next up: Teleporting for beginners.

. . .

This applies to "expanding" too. Although you can use an image to trigger the experience, really you should go for actually feeling it out, as if the space where your experiences arise *is* you, and so you can equally mentally scan the feeling of the space as you could your body. So, when you expand yourself, first notice the feeling of where you are located and - *being that* - expand it to fill your entire body space, and then out into the room. In other words, *become* the space occupied by your body, then *become* the space occupied by the room. It's like being a shape-shifter, if that makes any sense.

In all these endeavours, the key is to resist trying to "do" these things as a manipulative technique - you don't need to, and it actually works against you! What you'd end up doing is accidentally asserting your current state, then trying to shift to the target state.

Something to play with, is to begin by "ceasing". Just "stop generating" intentions, stop holding onto your attention, gripping onto parts of the world. Almost instantly you'll feel more like you are "unlocated" in experience. And since you are no longer gripping (re-asserting the current state), you'll find visualisation easier, I'd say. And your body and thoughts will become more spontaneously responsive.

The feeling you'd have is something like that anything could move in any direction, like a perfectly balanced object which would respond without resistance to the slightest air movement. In this state, any intention (which is really just the "slight intensification of the pattern you want to experience") associatively triggers its extended pattern without obstruction. Hence, the intention "there is an owl in front of me" *is* the activation of the experiencing of an image in front of you, and you don't "do" it as such. This is why in many (good) books of visualisation, such as David Fontana's *The Meditator's Handbook*, the final stage is to have been persuaded that no effort is required, and that "the unconscious does it for you".

In your basketball scenario, having decided that you will get that triple, your mental and physical movements from then on will unfold in alignment with that. If you then manipulate things to "make it happen", you are actually *re-intending* and therefore disrupting the pattern that you have previously put in place.

> So, you go 'there is an apple and it's real' and see what happens

Yes, but not in words in the ultimate version (although words can associatively trigger things too); you just summon "the feeling of fact". This is obviously almost impossible to describe in language! But if you explore the idea that any part of a pattern automatically triggers into awareness whatever implies, in the same way that opening a door always implies a scene beyond, that's a good rule. So maybe spend a bit of time noting that "feeling of an image being there" next time you visualise, and then you can use that to associatively trigger things. Ideally, there should be no bodily-muscular component to this at all.

Advanced hypnotic techniques (e.g. Milton Erickson's approach as described in *Patterns of the Hypnotic Techniques of Milton Erickson*) are very much based around this. Triggering associations and using presuppositions. Experience always "autocompletes" to give a full landscape of sensory content. The apparent unfolding of a world and body are entirely down to this: adjusting the relative intensities of the pre-existing set of "all patterns".

[...]

> When you say summoning imagery that means the same thing as the two glasses trick, what exactly do you mean? How do I imbue 'visualisations' with any of the same intent? Do I go 'I'm visualising the aftermath of what I wish to happen?' will it so, and then leave it?

Not exactly sure on the question, but... I'm saying that **any act - mental or physical - means what you decide that it means**, or takes on the power implied by its extended pattern. So when visualising an end state while implicitly deciding that doing so *means-that* it will happen (the default for most people): the act of visualisation = the content is true. Or pouring water which implicitly *means-that* the situation is being shifted from one state to another: the act of pouring = the situation is updated.

> So visualising something and knowing it to be true is all that is needed, I think I get it.

Yeah, that's the essence of it - your world is *literally* solidified imagination; to visualise something and *imagine-that* it has certain properties is to *literally* create a "soft" object with those properties.

You can always simply *assert* a fact, which is basically to increase the intensity of the abstract pattern that *is* that fact. But because that is *direct* and there's not necessarily a sensory component to that, it's: a) impossible to describe, b) has no technique associated with it. So it's easier to assign properties to intermediate objects or events. (The visualising of an image is, of course, an *assertion of its existence*, but because we are focused on the content of the image we tend not to worry too much about how it is coming into being. Answer: it just is.)

[...]

> You moved your arm?

In a way, he moved his arm for the first time ever. It's more impressive than it sounds.

> In what way? I'm genuinely curious as to why you guys are giving him praise for moving his arm

Well, it's part of a larger thing of having movement happen "by itself" - by intention or an imaginative act, rather than effort. It's hard to describe in words. So, raise your arm now. How did you do it, *exactly*?

> I moved it.

That's not an answer. So, people with bad posture, why don't they just stand up straight, eh? Problem solved - simple!

> It's nothing special, do you plan out every single movement when you walk or when you catch something thats suddenly fallen?

It's pretty special, really! But no, hopefully you don't plan out every movement - but examining how *exactly* you move your arm, tells you a bit about how your intention and state works, how you can become more effortless and dynamic, and has broader implications for how you view and handle yourself in the world.

Even just taking a moment to "find" your arm mentally - what exactly is "your arm"? Then move it - what is that "thing" you do? How does "your arm" change in relation to that? These sound like easy questions with obvious answers, but actually they're not so obvious from a subjective point of view (which is how you actually live and move). If you don't know what you are doing, then you can't do it differently. Those people with bad posture *can't* just stand up straight, no matter how many muscular exercises they do. *This* is the process by which they discover what they're doing wrong, and stop doing it.

[...]

> I think people as a whole love mysteries, but love them more if they can be eventually understood.

That's a really nice way to put it. I think some people find this sort of thing *both* fascinating and frustrating because, really, there is no "how it works" explanation, there's just different ways of saying the same thing - all at the same level - that you can pick and choose from. After all, what you're really doing is "thinking 3-dimensionally" and noticing that your experience (which is itself just a "solidified" 3D-thought, one realises) then melts a little and shifts towards that thought. There's actually no deeper explanation available.

> [Q: 90% of people can't handle when something can't be 'physically' solved. I'm sure if I explained that I did the two glasses trick to most people who didn't know me well, I'd either get a polite response (and I'd know what they'd be thinking) or ridicule. But there are a few people who, either inherently are able to shut off the rational part of their brains naturally, or have experienced enough non-physically explainable things (I'm a bit of both) to just say 'fck it, this *will work', and thus it does.]

Yes, that's very much why the glasses exercise is presented as a demonstration, "a bit of fun" - but then obviously I have to put the warning on the end that you should only do it for a result you're happy to live with. There *is* that thing of: things can't move if you're holding onto them. Determination to be in control or to only allow "permitted" things to happen blocks things. The whole faith and surrender thing really is the way.

Reply to “Getting ready for third jump, questions”

For the first one, I'd say it's just in the nature of the beast sometimes. You come to this already "patterned" with a world. You intend an outcome, and the fact of that outcome is incorporated into that world-pattern. Not in any intelligent way; it's like a "dumb patterning system" where the pattern is just kind of "intensified over" or overlaid upon the existing pattern, deforming it. The *only* thing that is predictable, is the exact intentional pattern that you are asserting. Any seeming winding ups and downs that appear in the sequence of moments between *now* and *then*, are just how the addition ended up.

This is why looking for "signs from the universe" and so on is a problematic approach. The *only* thing that is a sign of success, is the subsequent experience of the outcome. There is *no guarantee* of some joyful experience between now and that outcome. See also, perhaps: "letting go" and synchronicities and also an extended discussion that mentions "no guaranteed joy".

For the second one, you are maybe getting bogged down in *pictorial* visualisation and *object-based* specification: You don't need to fully specify in that way. After all, even if you had a clear notion of what the visual experience of a desired outcome would be like, you have still completely omitted to define the exact surrounding circumstances. You have still not be *truly* sure of the best desired replacement situation, only a fragment of it. And so, I suggest that *if you can conceive at all* of an aspect of the desired situation, than that conception actually *is* the desired pattern you want to increase the prominence of in experience. It may only be a *feeling-knowing* without any sensory-type components. That is totally fine. Intend *that* into prominence. In other words, you "general idea that things need to change" and a "direction and some details" is sufficient.

Both your questions seem more to do with self-doubt than anything else, maybe a worry about "getting it right". That's understandable of course, but really - because there is no *mechanism* involved and "how it works" is actually something which is intended, albeit implicitly, also - the main thing you need to do is decide what you want, and that can be as vague or abstract as you like too.

Aside - If you ever have difficulty deciding *at all*, then simply pausing quietly and "sitting with" the situation, not doing anything but just being with it mentally, will often result in an unfolding of it within you, and new insight as to the facts of it, which in turn imply a new direction. Sometimes, even, that is all you even need to do, since that contemplate pattern *actually is* the situation. (Note: I am *not* talking here about *thinking about* the situation; I mean sitting and summoning it in mind, and just staying with it without forcing or interfering.)

> >If both persons have their own free will, and collectively oppose what your will is for them or are not aligned with it in any way, does it negate the shift?

Free will of "both persons" doesn't really have any role in the sense of there being opposing "wills" who are contributing to some sort of composite outcome. The very nature of "persons" is in question here. That idea of *personal* free will (and clashing or contributing) comes from an assumption that what you are is a *person-object* located within a *world-place*, and that "the world" corresponds to a "stable, simply-shared, spatially-extended 'place' unfolding in 'time'". In fact, the subreddit is, in effect, largely about exploring that assumption, and finding it to be in accurate. It's not so much that there are no "other people" involved, but that there are *no* people as such, including *you-as-person*. You just have experiences "as if" that were so.

Reply to “Astral projections meditation/ findings on my studies into the practice”

Some brief thoughts:

> >the shortcuts have potential dire consequences as the forces you would be dealing with are often beyond your control.

Scare-mongering, surely? (Albeit perhaps *self*-scare-mongering.) What are these "forces"? If you aren't in precise control of every detail (as some sort of conscious deliberate architect of the minutia), why would that necessarily mean that the gaps filled in would be with "dire" content?

> >Also, your subconscious mind has to agree

What exactly *is* a "subconscious mind"? Where is it and what is it made from? Does it operate independently, make decisions and do things separately? I suggest it is a conceptual fiction only.

> >as well as rituals such as spirit cooking and concepts black vs white magick I have decided that these practices are not safe and without properly trained people in your presence can really put you in a bad spot.

More scare-mongering, surely? This subreddit is not about "magick". Or at least, it's only about it in the sense that all such topics seek to capture something of the "nature of experiencing", aspects which our everyday assumptions and descriptions do not recognise, and draw attention to them. However, I feel that much of what you are saying is simply swapping one limited description (that the world of a "stable, simply-shared, spatially-extended place unfolding in time") with another one (the world is a "place seething with hidden forces and dangers independent of you, and you need to try and persuade your subconscious to help you out"). I'd extend this view to any romantic notions about "higher selves" and "spiritual growing" too, really.

Here, then, we're not only investigating "the nature of experiencing" (with "results" a target and excuse to do so), we're also pushing back on the nature of *descriptions about* experiencing. Doing so leads to a "meta" perspective that somewhat recontextualises many of the things you are talking about. In essence, it is not just the *specific content* of your experience which is driven by "patterning" of yourself (yourself as *you-as-awareness*, that which "takes on the shape of experiences", rather than *you-as-person*, a particular "structuring" of experience), but the *broader formatting* also. All your entities and levels of mind and so on, then, are as much "results" as any event-based outcome; they are all just yet more experiences, at the same level as all other experiences, on an "as if" ("as if something were true") basis only.

The only fundamental, permanent truth is the fact of *being-aware* - or "awareness" - with everything else temporary patterning on an "as if" basis. Rather than a person with a subconscious who is sending out requests into the world, you are more like a "non-material material whose only inherent property is *being-aware* or 'awareness', and which 'takes on the shape of' states of experience, states imply and define all subsequent sensory moments". Right now, for example, you have "taken on the shape of" apparently (on an "as if" basis) *being-a-person-in-a-world*. Meanwhile, this means that any so-called "magick" is, despite any theatrics that go along with it, a *self-shaping* of oneself into a new experiential state. All apparent entities or techniques or other causes that are experienced are just aspects of that state: moments as "results".

> Truth is that it seems much more plausible and even accurate that maybe actually we ALL (as everything else in that current moment of existence) are the state itself ?

Yes. I think you are assuming that when I say "awareness" that I'm meaning **an** awareness or **the** awareness, like it is an object or thing, or a personal awareness. That's not quite what I'm getting at. Nor am I saying that the world is "your" world, like a personal world. Instead, it's more like "awareness" is a non-material material that is in a particular state, and that state fully defines the world. And that "world-pattern" also fully defines all the people in it. However, the people aren't *beings*, they are *patterns*. The only "being" is *awareness*, and that is the only thing that ever "happens" or has "experiences".

So, right now, the experience you are having isn't an experience of *you-as-person*. Rather, it is *you-as-awareness* which is experiencing being the entire eternal state or world-pattern, with one particular aspect of that unfolded, the *you-as-this-person* perspective. The "person" is a pattern, and when that pattern is unfolded, that corresponds to a "person experience". But, as you say, "we are all the state" - in the sense that the state defines all of the people-patterns. However, *what you truly are* is always actually awareness, shaped into whatever experience you having at the moment.

So there are no "people" at all in the sense that it is usually meant: independent beings having independent experiences. However, there are of course "people" in the sense of their being experiential content that is apparently from the perspective of *being-a-person*. But a "person" is a patterned experience you might have, as awareness, and not something that you "are". All the poetic phrasing tends to be required because we are usually starting from the idea that we are a person, and then trying to describe the actual situation relative to that. I think it's probably more efficient, and leads to a more coherent overall description, to step back from that from the outset, and assert the alternate perspective. Then we can avoid "higher selves" and "forces" and "entities", because we can view them in the correct context from the beginning, and see everything from the viewpoint of "awareness".

That is, there is *being*, but there are not *being**s*** or independent objects. When we think of the world, we shouldn't think of it as a spatially-extended place scattered with objects like a sort of sensory moment except out there somewhere - but rather as a sort of eternal non-spatial "pattern" dissolved into the background of awareness, from which we might unfold experiences, including *person-perspective-formatted* moments of experience, with only one experience happening at a "time".

[...]

"Your own active artwork" is an excellent way to think about it.

Reply to “The Game (book)”

> For people here wanting to jump, belief is critical. It's not enough to just want or "think you can" ...but with jumping it is more forceful, powerful.

Another way to consider this, is: If "you" are not actually a person-object and "the world" isn't place, but rather you are "that which takes on the shape of" experiences, then there is no separation between *you-as-experiencer* and your experience or state. This means that all change is *direct* - and this means you can't fool yourself, you have to actually hold in mind the specific pattern. That is, you can't simultaneously hold a "doubt" pattern in mind along with the "outcome" pattern, or you've intended a combination of both.

Intention & Fact Patterns

Basically, you have to intend the fact of something - rather than intend just the possibility of that fact, or intend the experience of just trying to have the fact become true, or intend maybe your act will make it come true. With no intermediary to this, the intention *actually is* the change to your state.

Here, we have the term "intention" being the pattern you'd like to increase the contribution or "relative intensity" of in your ongoing experience; "intending" being the changing of that intensity, essentially by "becoming" the new state with that pattern incorporated. It's really just a deliberate increase of a pattern. If the intention-pattern is of the form of a "fact" or "outcome event", then that becomes "more true" in experience. If it is *not* of that form, then the pattern just becomes more prominent generally.

In fact, this second type is a way of understanding what happens when we see whatever we are reading about somehow arise in "the world around us". Effectively, we have "patterned" ourselves, overlaid or incorporated those structures into our state as *you-as-experiencer* or *you-as-awareness*, by attending to them for a while. (The *Owls of Eternity* exercise is of course an example of doing this deliberately.) A classic example of this is described in Philip K Dick's essay, *How to Build A Universe That Doesn't Fall Apart Two Days Later*.

Belief & Intentional Patterns

The word "belief" doesn't really capture this adequately, I think, because it seems to have multiple and even slightly contradictory meanings in common usage. It doesn't lend itself easily to a more technical discussion.

Anyway, so, as you indicate, it's not about "thinking that you can", because that isn't an actual change - it is just the experience of "thinking" with the content of "can do this". Or alternatively it is implicit intending of a state of something "being possible", with ones own interpretation of the concept of "possibility" coming into play. To actually make a change, you have to actually either intend something to the effect "it is true *now* that this happens *then*" or "it is true *now* that this fact is true" (the *Owls of Eternity* exercise is the non-specific version of that: it is essentially the fact "it is true *now* that the pattern 'owls' is prominent in my experience"). Alternatively, you intend something which *implies* that the desired fact is true, that leverages a pre-existing fact or pattern (like the *Two Glasses* does).

An illustration:

If, right now, you intend "the image of a red car" in your imagination, you either have the image there clearly, or you don't. You can't half-commit and get a clear image appear in experience: either you make a clear image (actually get an image of a car) or you are making some other sort of image (a blur, a mangle, or nothing). The

intention can be immediate (you assert it immediately as an experience) or implied (by assuming something does the work for you, a bridging pattern concept like "the subconscious" or whatever), but it is always direct in the sense that the actual pattern you end up intensifying is the one you get, not by something else working it out on your behalf nor the outcome you just hope for while not actually intending your outcome.

Books & Reality Patterns

> Anyway, there's something special about this book.

It's interesting that, in particular, quite a lot of children's books seems to lay out ideas about reality, its nature and flexibility, and in ways which are detailed enough that they don't seem to be just general fantasy fun. One example pointed out to me a while back is the *Children of the Lamp* series, particularly the first book, *The Akhenaten Adventure*. I did have links to images of the relevant pages; I'll see if I can find them later.

Also, the books of Philip K Dick, the essay author above, all have an underlying "reality is loose" theme that tends to bleed into everyday experience - particularly *Flow My Tears, the Policeman Said* and *Ubik*. The upshot is, that reading extensively around a topic, whether that be in the form of fiction or non-fiction, can be a great way to adopt new frameworks and have the corresponding experiences arise in the "world around you". This, basically, is the whole idea of "active metaphors" - but with the notion that we can incorporate the intention that these patterns become prominent and therefore gain a stronger effect, rather than simply have it happen passively.

Extra bit: it is also interesting to consider that, since there is no "outside" to experience, the experience of apparently "encountering books which seem to speak about the nature of reality and then seeing their content become prominent in the world" is *itself* an example of a patterning of one's state.

[...]

Hey, them owls, they do get everywhere! :-) I've had a very owl-based few days myself, in fact.

Aside - Owl *events* rather than owl *noticings*. Which I think is an important distinction to make, because it marks the difference between "seeing things that were already there" and a more definite "patterning" of experience. Of course, if you play with this for a while, it in any case quite soon becomes obvious that this is not "confirmation bias" in the sense of selecting details from a static 3D environment.

> I get a vague sense that there is almost a "security measure" in place, preventing all of our thoughts from expressing themselves physically

Heh, funny how *Star Trek TNG* spends every other episode touching on these sorts of themes, eh? It's like a reference library of analogies for these conversations. Anyway, I see it not as a "security measure" - that interpretation could be seen as an example of survivor bias? - so much as an inevitable observation one would make when in a position to be able to make it. That is, that the only world-experience that would ever get to persist in the first place, would be one where there was an "inertia" pattern as a dominant property. That's why, in general, your main strand of experience is "this world" whilst other strands are "your passing thoughts".

However, you *can* have multiple "worlds" that *do* operate with the same inertia (creating "persistent realms" in lucid dreams, for example). And I'm sure you could have the experience of running them simultaneously too. As you say, though, the stumbling block is modifying the main strand "world" to make it less (but not

completely) inertial - assuming, that is, one isn't satisfied with having other worlds available for all that flexible fun and leaving this one as it is.

But then, if we use the "patterning" model where the world is viewed as being defined as essentially a stack of contributing "fact-patterns", wouldn't there be a fact-pattern that was the equivalent of the statement "it is true *now* that this world is inertial"? Would the best approach perhaps be to attend to and assert *directly* a change in this pattern?

> I AM jumping to such-and-such dimension. I AM a powerful co-creator of my experiences. I AM able to shape and mold my world.

Right - just as you are highlighting there, if we are metaphorically-speaking "increasing the intensity of contribution of a pattern in our experience", then the pattern has to be the actual fact you want to "make true". Now, this pattern isn't actually the words, of course. We might say that the words are a "verbal aspect" of the pattern, that they are a part of the extended pattern, or that they trigger the pattern by association. The actual experience of recalling the pattern itself, though, is just as sort of objectless "knowing". And we can intend that directly, without thinking the words or an symbol, just by finding it by "feeling-knowing", and then increasing it. We do this all the time, of course. When we deliberately lift our arm, we don't say little sentences to ourselves and then trigger the arm; we simply summon the (non-verbal) fact of "it is true *now* that my arm lifts up *then*", and then the result arises within sensory experience.

From there, we also have the topic of what you might call "clean" intention. That is, intending a fact or outcome *only*, without also intending some sort of additional result as part of producing a "doing" experience ends up re-implying our current state.

Essentially, intending involves no *activity* at all, because apparent activities are always *results* (subsequent experiences in "sensory theatre"); whereas intending is a name for *self-shifting* and is causeless. Even with the *Two Glasses* exercise, our physical body movements are basically movements from nowhere, but we are distracted from this by the narrative of ourselves as "brains as body controllers" - and this is used for advantage because it in turn distracts us from the fact that we are associatively triggering established patterns such as "level==strength" and "relocation==transformation" and "labels==identity" and so on, to get an *implied* result.

> I coined the phrase "is-ness" for me, reality, that place.

Yes, that all makes perfect sense. Other terms for the hypothetical "void" state might be "pure being", "clear awareness", and all that. Essentially, if all relatively true "facts" were to fade into the background so that none was more prominent in experience than another, then there's just a sort of non-spatial non-temporal openness. (I say "hypothetical" because the fact of still having some sense of observing means it is not entirely void.)

Reply to “Any help?”

As a general thought, though, when we find ourselves asking what something "really is" - e.g. is a dream where you aren't looking out of a bodily perspective "astral projection" - I'd say that what is "really happening" is whatever we are experiencing: the sensory experience *is* what is happening, with no true explanation "behind" it. Any descriptions or explanations we come up with, are *parallel* to that. So, someone might say "that's astral projection", but when you push deeper, "astral projection" will turn out to be just "the experience of apparently not being in a body" + a little story we made up. Similarly, someone might say that right now you are "an individual person walking around a shared, spatially-extended place unfolding in time", but *that too* would be a little story. This is the essence of the subreddit, perhaps. See: the "imagination room" metaphor, for example.

So, my issue with those explanations isn't that they aren't useful or can't fit, it's just that they are promoted as being "what is really happening" rather than a metaphor (in the same bag as the "brain is a processor" metaphor and so on). They're a starting point, and it's only a problem if people interpret them as a conclusion. (In fact, I contend that there *is* no "what is really happening" in that sense.)

For OP, we can create metaphors in terms of "databases" which are "calculated" (but what "time" would that calculation occur in, since it can't be the same "time" that experiences occur in?) or a selection mechanism from static patterns (no calculation required, but where does mechanism reside?) and so on. These are all useful ways of thinking about things - and they are fun to play with - but they don't really *explain* things beyond providing a little story which fills a gap. They can't be used to make a prediction, for example. They are not "true" in a deeper sense.

That "true in a deeper sense" is what is interesting. So those metaphors are a starting point for exploration, but mainly, in the end, they are a starting point for recognising the nature of explanations *vs* the nature of experiencing. (In my view, of course!)

> >that happens when your consciousness accesses the "future probable database" as Campbell calls it.

That sort of thing is good for triggering questions, definitely. For example: What is "consciousness"? In what sense can consciousness be "yours"? What is a "future" exactly, and in what way can it exist? What does it mean for consciousness to "access" something? In what way, by what, and where and when, are patterns "calculated"? The attempt to answer those questions is what makes the description useful, I think, rather than the content of the description itself.

In the end, I anticipate that where people get to is that descriptions don't matter *at all* for living life, except as a way of formulating intentions.

> >You're right, it's just inherently impossible to correctly explain a reality by using patterns from the "sub-reality"

Yes. I'd emphasise, though, that it's even more basic than that might initially suggest. That is, even concepts such as "reality", "sub-reality", the idea that we are "in" anything, that there are "higher" or "lower" realities, "physical" or "non-physical" - all suffer from the same problem.

Which can be summarised as: *thinking is itself just another experience, at the same level as any other experience*. Even thoughts about "an outside" are also "inside" experience, including the notion that anything is "happening" other than the current experience, or the assumption that the formatting of experience (spatial extension and unfolding in time) corresponds to the format of... *that*.

Glancing at that post, yes I'd pretty much agree with it, as far as it goes, and I have gone through the book. (There wasn't that much in it for me in that "a-ha" way, but it's a thorough description of that sort of structuring approach, and I found his personal history interesting.) But then: does it actually go anywhere, really? This applies to my own descriptions also.

> >Consciousness can do whatever it's capable of.

We always end up with tautologies like this: it all just *is*, is the conclusion. [Pasting from a comment elsewhere:] We can think about this forever, but it's really something that is directly realised. For example, we might close our eyes and try to:

- a) find the "edges" of your current experience,
- b) find where "you" are in your current experience.

and:

- c) investigate what your current is experience is "made from".

Those observations are *the facts*. Everything else must adhere to those facts. The conclusion is super-simple, but it's not object-based and so can't be described at all, only pointed to. But we can try with something along the lines of:

- What you truly are is a non-material "material" whose only property is *being-aware*, which "takes on the shape of" experiences, and has all possible experiences "dissolved" eternally within it.

Or similar. Beyond this, we end up just trying to create the most minimal description that includes the fact that "experience is structured in some way", while avoiding including errors by referencing any material, spatial or temporal terms.

> >When you pick everything apart, it seems to come down to just that. Awareness being aware of things.

And perhaps more strictly speaking: Awareness being aware of itself *as* things. Or rather, *as the experience of apparent things*.

> >But it would also seem unproductive and unlikely for consciousness to have all this experience going on, without gaining anything from it.

Doesn't this envisage awareness as something "other", though, that has aims and purpose independent from the experience you are having right now? It paints awareness as ***a* being**, rather than just **being**. Awareness, though, isn't a thinking and doing thing - rather, it's what the experience of thinking and doing is "made from". *(Pondering:)* It is important, I think, to not imagine awareness as being what the world is made out of - in the sense of there being a 3-dimensional place and it's made from awareness, with us within that place. Even more abstract descriptive schemes often contain that hidden assumption. This isn't the case though. There is only subjective experiences. Awareness takes on the shape of experiences, not places.

Bringing it right down to the immediate: The current "moment" of 3-dimensional experience right now is of *apparently* being "over here" with the screen "over there", but a brief pause to investigate reveals that "you" are actually "everywhere" in this "moment". And there's nothing else.

Consciousness can't evolve, because it is "before" time. Time exists only as an experience. This means that evolution and being productive and having a purpose - none of that belongs to consciousness. You can experience having thoughts and feelings of those things, but that is *content*, not *context*. We can have experiences "as if" such things are true, but they are only ever *relatively* true. The only thing that is *fundamentally* true, is *being-aware* ("awareness", not of anything specific). Awareness has no meaning as such. Meaning only exists in the accumulated patterns, relative to one another.

It is helpful, I think, to make a distinction between this fundamental aspect ("the truth") and what is meaningful in terms of "being patterned as a human experience". Meaning is to be found in our current state, and not in our recognition of the fundamental nature. That recognition merely gives us an insight into our true situation, and lifts the restrictions which only exists in our narratives *about* ourselves (including the metaphors me, you and Tom employ for the purposes of discussion).

That's just a shifting of definitions, surely - because we lack decent words for this, "consciousness" having been used to mean all sorts of different things. Broadly speaking, people use it interchangeably for three different things:

- *"Consciousness-of"* - The experience of being conscious of content, as apparently separate objects.
- *"Self-consciousness"* - The experience of identifying oneself with a particular part of that content.
- *"Consciousness"* - The non-material "material" whose only inherent property is *being-aware* and is not an object or personal, otherwise known as "I AMness". It is "before" division, multiplicity, change, any structure.

The first two are best described as "patternings" or "states" of the the third. When I use the word "awareness", I mean that third definition. When you use the word "consciousness" in your example, you are referring to the first one, perhaps with a hint of the second.

I use "awareness" for this, because the word typically has less connotations. Although it is lumbered with sometimes being used by people to mean "within one's attention", at least you can then suggest that if one ceased to focus one's attention at all, it would be without boundary or location, which is a reasonable metaphor all on its own.

While awareness might taken on the shape of an *experience* of apparently thinking and doing, it does not actually think or do anything in and of itself. It *becomes* a state, it does not *do* anything (which would imply a subject and object relationship) fundamentally. It "takes on the shape of" other properties, but they are not inherent properties of consciousness. They are temporary, and there is nothing "behind" them, no persistent solid underlying substate supports them. They are "just" patterning, at the same level, non-hierarchical.

So, for sure, awareness might get formatted into the experience of "being an evolving digital system", but no aspect of that will be the "fundamental elements of *consciousness*" (as per the definition), although they might be considered the building blocks of a metaphor describing a particular pattern of "*consciousness-of*".

Broadly speaking, if we separate things into *content* (the relative transient truth of structuring) and *context* (the fundamental unchanging truth of the nature of experiencing) we can keep things straight, though, I say.

Aside: We have to tread carefully here anyway. As soon as we talk about, for example, an "evolving, digital system", we should pay attention to how, exactly, we are imagining this - by which I mean, right now. Do we imagine it from a "view from nowhere"? Are we seeing little cellular automatons doing their stuff, as visual thoughts in our mental space? How, exactly, does this translate to something in reality?

If we are not thinking of something as a 1st-person experience, we must consider how that 3rd-person view makes sense. Does that "diagrammatic" view ever get experienced? And then in what sense does it ever "happen" or even exist? And so on. The implication is that, if we imagine something occurring in an "objective world", then we are "already wrong" in a way. Although all of that doesn't deny us the ability to create *useful* or *interesting* descriptions, it does mean that trying to be "right" with them is pointless. They are just more experiences, at the same level. "Awareness" or "I AMness" can be directly perceived or known, then - because you *are* it - but it can't be thought about. The conclusion here is that we must be clear about the purpose of our thinking, rather than just (as we all do now and again) hand-wavingly assume that we are investigating "the nature of reality" or whatever.

There's a bit more to it than that, though. We need to take care to notice not just what we are thinking about, but *how* we are thinking about it. It's this one step back, "meta" approach, that indicates certain things to us.

Awareness, as described, isn't something that is comprehended; it's not an object. "Awareness" is a conceptual object, sure, but it's intended to point at something which cannot be conceptualised at all. It is "*isness*". There is no concept that can be "behind" Awareness. It is the direct "I AMness" that you know intimately right now. I'd say it is something you experience, rather than think about, but even the word experience implies a sort of subject/object divide. You don't "comprehend" or "understand" it. This is where all that "the Tao that is spoken is not the true Tao" type stuff comes from.

It is *the* context, because without *being-aware*, this is nothing else. And remember, there is no "outside" to this (and no "inside") so it is actually meaningless (in the proper sense of the word) to talk of a "beyond". It has no location, no boundaries, no edges, no extent.

> ...that could be far outside the borders of our imagination.

Your imagination (and your experience more generally) has no borders. Go looking for borders in your experience, right now. Don't *think about* borders or beyonds, because all you'll do is imagine borders or beyonds *inside* experience. You'll be thinking a concept, rather than actually looking for borders. Actually "feel out" in your experience, as it is.

There's an inherent problem, which is: thoughts are *already divided* and even the thought about "undivided" is a divided thought, an object in mental space which only makes sense when related to other objects.

It is not possible to think about a subject - it is immediately "too late".

It's like trying to make a sandcastle which represents both "the beach" and "sand". The sandcastle, like every sandcastle, *is* both of those things, but it cannot *capture* those things. There is no sandcastle which could do so, simply due to the nature of sandcastles.

All we can do, is point to the fact that what we are talking about is, "not this, not that" (while being all things *and* nothing). Build sandcastles, and then attempt to draw attention to that which the sandcastle is "of" rather than "about". The direct noticing of this, though, is super-simple, and actually the simplest thing there is (and of course it is).

So, when we think about there being "fragments of consciousness" or whatever, we must pause, and actually look at the structure of the thought we are thinking here. Does it appear in your mind like a little diagram, for example? What, exactly, is the imagery? And how, exactly, is that imagery meaningful in terms of the context of that experience? "Reality" is *this*, right now, 1st-person, and that is what must always be included into any picture. The subject of any conceptual object must be part of the consideration. Content without context is fantasy (albeit perhaps a useful one, and there's an argument that your main strand of experience is a fantasy also, just that it is a 3D-immersive multisensory strand of thought).

(It'd be good to do this from the ground up really, but lacking time, so let's just to-and-fro for now.)

I'd shy aware from calling it a "source" since that implies spatial and temporal aspects - but we have to be easy on ourselves here, since we can only talk around this, rather than capture it. So, I would be careful of the language perhaps, and give ourselves a pass!

Awareness "takes on the shape of" experiences, and so the context and the content are one, of course. Also, when you say "not-yet-conscious" what you surely mean is "not yet *self-conscious*" as in our earlier discussion - but it is inherently *being*, eternally. This "raw" state is a hypothetical state, though, because it is always in some "shape" or other. The reason to make the distinction between content and context in our description, is - as well as avoiding saying "all that is, is" - that it permits us to distinguish between what is always true and what is not. The reason why might choose to say that awareness is "outside" of content in a sense, is that it is not reliant upon it, it has no foundation. We're making a distinction based on property and persistence, rather than material construction. From this, we'd say that awareness doesn't evolve, because time is "within" it; it is not bound by time. Awareness is "eternal" (as distinct from "forever"). And all possible patterns and facts and experiences are also "eternal". There is no creation, "creation is already complete", only relative intensity of patterns changes, and even that doesn't not happen "in time". So, we might say that content evolves, because time is an aspect of that particular content - it would still be static from the point of view of awareness, though - but the property of *being-aware* never does. All content could dissolve right now, for no reason - reasons exist only relatively, as the structure of content, after all - but this context would remain.

To consider: When new molecules are formed, or when molecules are annihilated, do "atom" and "molecule" evolve?

And: If awareness and content are one, then what does this mean for your experience, this sensory moment, right now? (Again: if you start thinking about things in the 3rd-person to answer this, you will immediately be "wrong", surely.)

> [Q: I can have the experience of imagining a reality as though true. i.e. 3rd person. surely then it is simply a case of experiencing the imagining as though real - 1st person. the trickiness comes from not getting caught up in the 3rd person and not accepting this reality as real]

I'd agree. If we say that a 3rd-person thought (a thought *about* something) is a bounded, located thought, then a 1st-person thought (the experience *of* something) would be an *unbounded, unlocated* thought - a patterning of the subject as a whole.

One might experiment, for example, with thinking *wordlessly* the thought "relaxed body" until it became true. That would be an example of patterning the 1st-person experience with the pattern "relaxed body". The result would be a shift in the content of experience towards a state where the pattern "relaxed body" was relatively dominant, without having "done" it.

You-as-person are "Maya" too. All experiential content is "Maya".

That's why this search for the "real" will never come to fruition. It's a *recognition* you have that applies to all experiences - that all experiences are *you-as-awareness* taking on the shape of an experience - rather than an experience in and of itself.

For example, look around now and see that what your present moment is made from, is "sensations, perceptions and thoughts" in awareness *with nothing "behind" them*. Reality == this experience, this moment which contains everything, that is all. Any *thoughts-about* those experiences are themselves experiences, *at the same level*. Standing outside, one looks out upon the scene before them. Beyond the house, a garden. Beyond the garden, a hillside. Beyond the hillside, the evening sky. Beyond the sky - "awareness". And then it is recognised, it was *all* awareness.

And equally: all experiences are direct experiences of the fundamental nature of reality (including experiences of apparently stupid people).

You have to be careful of abstracting this, though; it's a matter of "direct imagination" or "direct thinking". By which I mean, you should consider this as a *literal intensification* of a pattern or fact or scene within your current "3D thought of being a person in a world.

So - and I know you'd didn't mean this, but it's a good example - you probably don't imagine writing a script, because you would then have experiences of seeing scripts being written (or elements of the extended imagery of that). It's possible to do it like this so long as you do so *knowing-that* it is a direct interaction with the world, but mostly I think people end up just having a parallel fantasy with isn't attached to the main strand of experience.

Typically, then, what you do is, you intensify a desired "scene" (or "knowing of fact") as if it were actually happening (or true now) - and by doing so the fact of that scene happening is incorporated into your "3D world-thought". This doesn't necessarily mean you actually have to see and hear the scene; it's a sort of maximised *felt-knowing* of the pattern more than anything, from which visual imagery may or may not arise, as a side effect.

The word "incorporated" is important, I'd say: you should generally take the approach of intensifying into fact the *desired final outcome*, rather than any particular path towards it. Your strand of experience is already heavily patterned, and it will be naturally overlaid. If you focus on the means by which an outcome will arise, you often end up generating the experience of the means as your outcome, rather than the experience of the end.

Of course, if you are feeling particularly adventurous you could aim to create a full discontinuity, without any apparent paths, jumping straight to the "scene" and having the world implied by the scene from that moment onwards, but that's something for you to choose to experiment with or not.

> >i had thought about that - like condensing my entire 'experience' of the 'the world' into one thought and then creating a new thought

Yes. And I'd say that this is the situation right now: the entire world *is* this moment, a single thought, static and fully deterministic between intentional shifts, and "time passing" is itself a static pattern as part of that thought's overall patterned state. A thought *of* a world.

We tend to assume that our experience is just the "unfolded" visual, auditory, textural aspects, but actually we are experiencing the entire world in this moment, it's just that the "felt global summary definition" is a sort of background, dimmed, dissolved feeling, rather than chunked up into bright objects. It's all active *now*, though - as one single pattern. If this wasn't the case, there would be no *meaning* to the moment. (Simple illustration: when you see a car, you don't see a shape, you see "a car", and in fact a *particular* "car". The car *is* that *felt-meaning* rather than just the unfolded sensory aspects.)

So: if we summon a single 3D multi-sensory image, and that image has *felt-meaning*, then it actually contains a whole world implied within it. This could correspond to a revised version of this current world, or a completely new one.

Pausing now, closing your eyes, imagine a man walking along a road. Don't *draw* the man and the road, just *imagine-that* there is a man walking on a road. A world has been created by this act, albeit not an immersive 1st-person one. Allow the scene to continue unfold without interference. Where does the man go? What do you find out about him? And so on. One might then ponder: what if I stepped into this world by allowing the scene to surround me? Or, what if I adopted the 1st-person viewpoint of the man?

> >one might ponder that...but that would be a ponderance ;)

Heh, a ponderance it would be, indeed! :-)

> >things only seem to change when i do something

Which is fine, an (apparent) mental or physical act which has an assigned meaning which is the outcome, is a perfectly legitimate (by which I mean an "unfolded" experience as the apparent act). The act itself is also a result, but having assigned causality to the experience of the act, the result is part of its pattern (the Two Glasses exercise uses this approach). The act doesn't need to be sensory - it can be simply an act of "knowing you are shifting" with no content in the moment at all - but I'd agree that it is generally helpful to have a sensory aspect or imagining that counts as the "theatre" of making a change.

> >the car is the subject and i am the object (of experience) but both are me

Actually, it's probably better to say that you are the subject and the car is the object - you can't find your edges, but you can find the edges of the (sensory aspect) of the car. But yes, it's all you anyway, so with that known the distinction doesn't matter.

> since i just want one particular experience, i'll focus on that.

Good. Both from a desired outcome point of view, and also in terms of conducting an experiment and explore experiencing, that's good. You don't need a clear (visual) image; you just need a clear "knowing". Since we're talking about "direct imagination" or "direct thinking" here, the path doesn't really matter - just as if we draw a picture on a metaphorical flexible television screen, it doesn't matter what the story was that was being shown onscreen prior to it. We simply *assert* the new picture, and either that becomes the new starting point (extreme discontinuous case), or it becomes dissolved into the current programme and incorporated into it.

By "knowing" I mean more that, for example, you "know" a fact even though you are not experiencing any sensory aspect of it, physically or mentally - sort of "objectless thinking". Not sure "order" or "timing" is necessary as such; but if you mean "fully summoning a scene as a fact" then, yes, that's definitely a possible approach, in the spirit of this "direct asserting" we've been talking about. Pursue that and see where it leads?

What's a "belief", though? I'm not a fan of the term; its meaning it not clear. Ultimately, what you want to do is "think it until it is true", which is different than (as some people consider belief to be) "thinking *that* something is true".

> the problem I have is I constantly think ***it isn't true***. so by believe I guess I mean I think that it is true and it will occur because I believe in it

Well, you really need to give up that bad habit, then! :-) Perhaps you could work on the *meta-fact* of "thinking things makes them true". That would capture the essence of it, the desired *formatting* of your experience, both in the form of a "belief" and the form of a "world-fact".

In all of those, though, you are assuming you and other as separate, but this is not the case. What you are is the aware thing that "takes on the shape of" this sensory moment, of apparently being "over here" and these words being "over there" - but a short pause, close your eyes, feeling out to try to find yourself, you find that you are "nowhere-everywhere". What is real is:

- The current experience, specifically *you-as-the-experience*.

When you think about theories in attempt to describe reality, the *experience of thinking the theories* is true, but the theories themselves are not real (in the sense that the ideas don't correspond to anything "behind" experience; there is no "behind"). *So, based on that perspective, let's try some quick snappy answers to those statements:*

>what is reality?

It is *you-as-awareness* having adopted the shape of whatever the current experience is.

>what is true?

Only the fact of *being-aware* is unchangingly, fundamentally true. Everything else is relatively, temporarily, true only, for as long as it is the current experience.

>what is real?

If we define real as "that which is always true", then the only thing that is truly real is the property of *being-aware*.

>what is observed by me?

Being cute about this: yourself, as whatever the current experience is. You don't actually observe anything, rather you take on the shape of the experience of *apparently* observing something.

>everything i see and feel is as a result of my environment

No, everything you see and feel is the result of you taking on the shape of experiencing "seeing" and "feeling". The environment is an experience you have adopted; meanwhile, "the environment" is a concept which does not represent anything outside of that.

>i act and do things within my environment

You shape yourself into the experience of apparently being a body acting within an environment.

>i sense things accordingly and act accordingly

You don't sense things, you take on the shape of the experience "sensing things", and then take on the shape of the experience of "taking action".

when did that occur?

Since time itself is part of an experience, and not inherently part of *you-as-awareness*, it never occurred in time. It is *eternal* (rather than "forever"). It is actually meaningless to talk of things occurring in time at a fundamental level. The "moment" you have currently taken on the shape of might have an apparent time aspect, or history, but that could shift right now leaving no trace, to a different "moment" with a different apparent history.

>do I observe myself taking shape or am I actually the shape?

You are actually taking the shape. There is no "outside" to you, for you to observe yourself taking shape. I say that you take on the shape *of an experience*, to make it clear that you are not actually "over here" as a true external observer - rather, you are the whole experience, taking on the shape of *apparently* being "over here" and other stuff being "over there". As mentioned previously, if you close your eyes and pause and search for a moment - rather than thinking about this - you'll quickly discover that you are in fact everywhere and everything (which is also to so, no particular place and no particular thing).

>so there is no difference between "me" and the ("my") environment

Right. There is no difference between "you" and "the environment". It is all you. To make the distinction clear, we sometimes say *you-as-awareness* (meaning the whole experience) and *you-as-person* or *you-as-perspective* (meaning that experience of apparently being "here").

[Q: then I can shape myself into the experience of apparently being a body who directly alters his environment

so no action really occurs beyond my belief in it - i.e. I only apparently act but I can also act without acting - receive the results of karma (action) without doing the work (कर्म करोति karma karoti - doing action)]

I'd say that no action (or experience of an apparent action) occurs beyond your adoption of it as part of your current state or "shape", which is itself an accumulation of intentions and their implications. That - intentions-implications - could be interpreted as corresponding to the concept of "karma".

> >but things can also happen without my direct performance of an action-with-desired-outcomes - i.e. intention

Ultimately, you "think it" in the sense of "thinking that it is true" or "asserting it", and that's what increases its "brightness" or "truth". You are doing this anyway: if you perform a physical act with an outcome attached to it, then the physical act itself came from nowhere. The act was a "result" just as much as the outcome was; it was all one pattern, brought into experience.

For example, if you pause now and think of a red car, the red car appears. How do you do that? Note that, even if you thought the words "red car" beforehand, that wasn't the cause, that too was a result, and so the question then becomes how did you think the words? Truly, you simply "became" them, or you might say you reshaped yourself such that those patterns, that experience, was brought into prominence.

> >performing an action thus sounds like duality in this context (because i would still like to do some actions but the result is not in any way directly derived from the action)

Not a duality, though, if you ponder it a little more. An action is an experience, you *are* experience, you are simply shape-shifting, causelessly. If the action and the outcome are not logically related *in-world*, that is okay - you simply adopt the notion that "this action" *means-that* "this outcome" happens, and that overall pattern is what is intended/asserted.

> >this is my stumbling block! i keep having competing thoughts - "there will be no red car" - and thus nothing changes :P

You really should give that up! ;-) So, you simply have to be more fully assertive. It's completely under your control, it is all you after all. You *don't fight* those competing thoughts, just as when you walk through a door in a room you don't spend time trying to fight the fact that you can see other doors. You simply purposefully attend to the door you want to go through, withdrawing yourself from, *forgetting*, the other doors.

[...]

> >I can't bring myself to a solid conclusion about what awareness or consciousness is

There is no conclusion (in thought) to come to, about what awareness is - it simply *is* and can't directly known to be so, but it's in the manner of an insight, rather than a logical conclusion. It's a fact of this moment; one needs to switch to *attending* and *intending*, rather than *thinking* (which is just a deformation of your present moment really, rather than a revealing of it).

> >But one thing we should agree on is that humans are more aware than a bumblebee.

Human beings aren't aware at all. "Human being" is an experience that awareness can have. You *are* that awareness. The phrasing would go something like:

- "What you truly are is 'awareness', which is currently 'taking on the shape of' the experience of apparently *being-a-world-from-the-perspective-of-a-person*."

Now, we might be tempted to say that this experience is evolving, but actually I would say that it is not. It is static. What is apparently changing, is the *sensory content*, but from the perspective of an overall state, it is unchanging and deterministic unless shifted by intention.

One might conceive of this as that there are all possible states, always present and active, but differing in their relative "brightness" at this moment (the eternal Now). The divisions we make between states, sensory moment, eternal patterns, and so on are essentially arbitrary though.

A couple of things, which are really the same thing:

- In my view, you must think about this from a 1st-person perspective, otherwise this is pointless fantasy. You must recognise that you are awareness, taking on the shape of *this experience*, meaning *this shape of "moment"*.

  If you are thinking about it in an abstract, 3rd-person way, diagrammatic model kind of way rather than actually linking this to your *current experience right now*, then it doesn't lead anywhere, I would suggest...

- What is the purpose of this theorising?

  We're basically just drawing pictures the mind, essentially in parallel to our main strand of experience. We never get to something "behind" that main strand, because: a) we are always working in parallel, at the same level, and: b) there *is* no behind.

  In what way do *you* think the two are connected?

My answer to that final question is: only by both being experiences in/as awareness. They are both made from "sensations, perceptions, and felt-knowing". One experience, the model, does not describe the other, the strand. Rather, the value of a model is that it may lead you to recognise something at a "meta" level: that thinking and perceiving are of the same nature. In effect, your main strand of experience is also a thought in and of awareness - albeit a 3D, unbounded, multi-sensory, particularly bright strand of thought. You are not *in* a world, you are having a thought *of* a world. All the time, as we consider this stuff, we must retain that "meta" step back and be aware of ourselves as context, notice what it is that is actually happening when we "think" or we "perceive": patterns in *you-as-awareness*. Otherwise we are getting lost in content and mistakenly consider experience to be something that can be "understood" or "solved"; it isn't.

A question to ask yourself: do you feel that the world, or your experience of it in this current moment, is outside of you or inside of you? I don't mean what you think about this, I mean do you perceive that the current scene is inside of your perspective?

Okay, so that's a nice description. It's seems fairly self consistent, it depicts a structured view that can be logically explored within its own terms; it's a coherent "castle". *But -*

- What is it a description *of*, exactly?

Pause for a moment, become aware of the room you are in, then think about your description. Then notice:

- Where is that description located within your experience?
- Where is the room located within your experience?
- How, exactly, are the two related?

Note: Don't *think about* those questions and construct an answer to them. Rather, directly observe the situation and report it - if you see what I mean.

In all cases, though, I'd say you replied with explanations - referring to concepts - rather than your observations. I mean this much more simply: that you tell me what you are *actually* experiencing, rather than an interpretation using concepts (as far as possible).

For the first question, I meant literally where in your experience is it - not a conceptual description.

For the second, similarly.

For the third, again, I mean literally, their actual observed relationship, rather than a description which you do not, in fact, perceive other than in the thinking of it.

Personally, I've never experienced a "being-level" or "being modified" or "experiences" being "generated" by "interactions". Do you see what I'm getting at? All that stuff falls within the first question, because once again we are engaged in "describing". With those answers, we are potentially answering all the questions in a way that obscured the answer to the first question, which would have made the answers to all the questions different.

So we might say they're at the same level. One isn't "behind" the other one; they are both arising within the same "space" (using that term for convenience), "beside" or "parallel" with one another in that space (loosely).

Now, to clarify things further - revisiting one and two: what are they "made from"? What is their nature? And do they differ? And if so, how do they differ? Again by observation, by directly attending to the experience of them, rather than theorising.

And what is this "me", what is "me" made from? And *where* is "me"?

(Then we'll pick up those other bits.)

Okay, so perhaps jumping ahead here (we can reel back if we've gone too far) -

So, although we use words like "consciousness" and "me" (or "awareness"), which objectify it for the purposes of discussion, it's really just *isness* or *IAMness* or "this/that" and so on. And "consciousness" and "me", being words or concepts, are also made from and within that, so we have to be careful to see them pointers to "nowhere-everywhere" - and not object-concepts which can be manipulated or used in models and descriptions.

Now, remembering the "feeling out" exercise earlier in the thread, when we close our eyes and go looking, we find: that experience has no edges, no boundary, no outside; that "me" is not located anywhere, but is everywhere in that experience; that the present experience is entirely "made from" or "of" this "me".

So, looping back, we see that the relationship between the main strand of experience and our descriptions, the connection, is that they are essentially both experiences of the same nature. One is not "behind" the other, one does not "describe" the other; that idea is itself a concept. They are like parallel-simultaneous strands of sensory-formatted experience, like strands of thought, within *you-as-awareness* - although one of those strands is "unbounded" and "unlocated", making it the 1st-person strand which we end up identifying with as part of a "world".

We conclude, then, that our experience of the world takes the form of sensations made from awareness, and there is nothing behind them at all - there is no outside, no levels, and no depth to our experiences. *No world, as such.* This is where I get that summary of: *you-as-awareness* "taking on the shape of" the apparent experience of *being-a-world-from-the-perspective-of-a-person*.

So - Descriptions don't matter. We are effectively directly *imagining-that* we are a person in a world, we are having experiences "as if" this is true, but it is only true as a *moment-shape* we have taken on, a thought we are *having-being.* Descriptions are just another experience.

Descriptions don't matter - except in one way, which flips around the everyday notion of what a description or explanation is about. *But first* - Pause now, close your eyes. Now, raise your arm. What was the nature of that experience? What do you actually experience? And: how did it come about? Again, from observation.

Remember, though: observations only. Describe the experience itself, not any conceptualisations (which are *another* experience, as we have noted in the discussion above).

Did you *actually experience* "interpretation of data" or "receiving from a system" or "being integrated"?

Did you *actually experience* "utilising free will" or "reality reacting" or "the logic of a ruleset"?

Don't go beyond what is actually experienced.

Okay, good. So, I'll suggest a couple of things and see if they fit your experience:

1. What constitutes this "1st person perspective" - when left uninterrupted - is the experience of being like an open space, with various sensations floating in it, phasing in and out.

   You do not actually experience being a body, as such; it's a scattered bunch of sensations, with a visual image floating in one direction, and sounds distributed around, and so on. Everything seems to be both "over there" and "here".

   If you place your attention on these words on this screen, and then decide to direct your attention to "the place you are looking out from", you'll find a sort of structureless void. If you follow this direction, it goes on forever, and in fact goes on in all directions.

   You cannot find a "person" anywhere in this experience - except when you summon the *thought of* a person: an idea or concept, which is itself an experience of course (of thinking about "a person").

2. When, as you just did, you deliberately make a change such as raising your arm - you cannot find the cause of that change. You only experience the "result".

   Even if you were to have the sense of "about to do this" or a thought of "I'm going to raise my arm", you'd have same problem: those would be results too, with no detectable cause, and they certainly didn't cause the arm-raising, since there is no overlap between them; they are one-experience-then-another.

   As you attend to this, you recognise that there *is* no cause; the change is self-causing. You "know" you change it, but you cannot detect any mechanism or method or "doing" - only a shift in the content of experience. You eventually conclude it is as if you, as awareness, *shape-shifted* yourself into a different experience, simply by *becoming* it.

As usual, the wording makes this seem involved and complicated, when actually the direct observation or experience of it, is just that it *is* (with nothing "behind" it).

> >I do believe that this is a little picture way of looking at reality.

I would disagree with your points, somewhat inevitably. :-) *Let's see -*

First, I'm not detaching the "awareness" part really, I am saying it *is* reality. Not integrated - *is* it. And you are that. More importantly, it's not "things just happen for no reason". It's true that things don't happen for an *in-world* reason, because all *those* reasons are, in fact, results. The reason for all of those, though, is the *one* reason: named "first cause" or "intention" or "direct imagination" "unbounded thinking-that" or "awareness shaping itself".

The second part is where it all leads, because (as promised earlier) it changes what a "description" is. A description is not an explanation or an understanding of an experience, it is its own pattern in parallel. However, if you intend an act *in terms of* a description, then you imply the extended pattern of that description in your experience. You are intending the description as well as the outcome. In other words, the *use* of descriptions *causes* us to have experiences corresponding to them; continued use of a description stabilises the patterning of our experience in accordance with the description. This is contrary to the usual view that descriptions are independent patterns which reflect a separate, structurally stable ongoing experience.

This has the fun side-effect that whatever worldview you are playing with, you will tend to experience encountering evidence which supports it. If you change your mind and commit to it, the evidence will change accordingly. If you are undecided, the world will seem messy. If you "go meta" and start experimenting with the idea that the "imagination room" metaphor is almost literally true, you will have super-flexible experiences which confirm for you that there is no "world" or "system" at all as such - at least, not one that can't be instantly dropped as just a strand of thinking. (The same applies to the other "Active Metaphors" listed in the sidebar.)

> >It does makes sense for awareness to evolve and grow within and along with its entire consciousness system.

That's just a story, though. You can have experiences "as if" that were true, for sure, but if your pursue this line of investigation you'll quite quickly realise that you can have experiences "as if" pretty much *anything* is true. This is because *intention* is the only cause, and if you intend a description into prominence - or more likely, intend and act which *implies* a description - you will tend to have experiences which correspond to that description.

All narratives about "evolving and growing" and there being "systems" - definitely, you can live that. However, whenever you pause and stop thinking about it, stop implying it, you'll notice that, still, all you are *actually* experiencing is being "awareness" which has taken on the shape of an open space with sensations (both thoughts and perceptions) floating in it. You never get outside of that.

Which is why some people use the "you are the dream dreaming itself, the content and the dreamer as one" metaphor (although I think that "dream" has a lot of associations which can get in the way really).

Note: I've tried to be clear, but this can be a hard point to get across: I'm not saying that "an open aware space in which sensations arise" is fundamental either. That *too* is just a shape awareness can take on. *There is no inherent structure to you-as-awareness at all.* The only fundamental, persistent truth is the dimensionless, locationless, eternal property of *being-aware*. Furthermore, as I tried to highlight previously, but it's worth emphasising: although I'm using the word "awareness", I'm not using the word in the usual sense of word-usage, and definitely not an object; the word doesn't point to anything at all, not *even* "everything". It's a placeholder for "not-nothing, not-something", the context that is also the content but isn't either, and so on. "The awareness that can be talked of is not the true awareness", you might say.

So. As a "way of looking at reality", then, this is not "a little picture" or indeed any other size of picture. Regarding "pictures", though, all pictures are arbitrary, and you can have experiences "as if" *any* picture is true. You may indeed be having experiences "as if" it makes sense for "awareness to evolve and grow within and along with its entire consciousness system", but that is just a relative experience; you've not got "behind" anything and it has nothing to do with the *nature* of experiencing itself, which is "reality". And, we should note, the "awareness" of that sentence is not the awareness I have been describing above, by that nature.

TL;DR: All that is ever "happening" is this 1st-person moment of experience. If we think about other things happening outside of that, if we pause we will notice that those thoughts are actually just happening within this 1st-person experience too. There is no outside cause to this 1st-person moment. The entire moment is you, and you are its only cause. You can have experiences "as if" outside things are happening, but closer inspection always reveals that it is only the 1st-person moment that is happening, with nothing solid "behind" it. Descriptions are best thought of as *potential patterning* rather than accounts of a stable persistent world-experience.

> >But even the experience of considering these concepts/ideas is just another pattern happening on the same level as all other patterns.

Indeed, the experience of considering these things, is itself an experience, with nothing "behind" it.

> >Patterns interacting with patterns, or rather: One big pattern interacting with itself.

Or actually: not interacting at all, because it is "before" time, and it is static between shifts (any apparent change due to the pattern of "time passing" is actually deterministic, fully defined in the state).

> >So what about this sensory pattern of human experience? This doesn't seem completely random and structureless to me...

Not random or structureless - a pattern. The pattern that corresponds to "apparently being a human being in a world".

> >they're having the experience of, and are having the experience of describing and conceptualizing.

The *patterns* aren't having an experience though. Rather, *you-as-awareness* has taken on the shape of a pattern. Awareness has - or really *is* - the experience.

Aside - Ultimately, we throw away even the "awareness" concept and just say that what we are *is* the experience that is happening. However, it is much easier to progress by "restating the observer" and withdrawing to that position gradually. Even afterwards, the notion of "awareness" is still useful for the purpose of discussion, but

we recognise that it is empty, just a pointer to the fact that experiences are experienced - or better, simply: "there is experiencing". However, "awareness + patterns" is the minimum structured model that "makes sense" for formulating descriptions which can be used as intentions.

> >And the patterns can increase or decrease entropy (decrease randomness, organize, become structures, give birth to more structures).

Hmm, I don't think that any of those things *happen*. Again, you can have experiences "as if" they do, but fundamentally there is no time other than the experience of time. The "imagination room" provides a little story which allows you to conceive of your experiences as *you-as-patterned-awareness*, but of course even *that* is itself not fundamental. In fact, the idea of "fundamental" is probably finally better replaced by the notion of no-hierarchy. But I've drifted a little bit there.

> >if there ever was a "beginning", which is another can of worms

A can of worms, indeed! There was no beginning, because there is no time other than the experiencing of it. Awareness or "the fact of experience" is eternal (as distinct from "being around forever"). It is "before" time. This does make things tricky, because the correct conclusion is that there is no evolution and no cause, although we can take on the shape of experiences which are "as if" there was evolution and cause.

> > Awareness at the early, primal stage of these patterns is barely aware, as there is barely any content to be aware of.

If we get rid of the idea of "primal stages" and just say that it is possible for awareness to be shaped such that it just *is*. You can produce that sort of experience yourself, in fact.

> > Information/patterns originate awareness, eventually organizing into a "pattern of awareness" which evolves and grows along with the "patterns of experience/content", working together as a system.

I don't think you mean "awareness" here. Patterns cannot originate anything (what are the patterns "made from"?). Patterns *are* awareness / awareness takes on the shape of patterns / experiences *are* patterned awareness. Patterned awareness is like a "static landscape"; it is not something that "interacts" or "grows' or "works together as a system". It is more like *a definition* that fully defines a deterministic set of moments; a current state corresponding to a particular set of contours. The definition is not read or processes or whatever, though - it is simply experienced, directly.

But none of that matters too much, really, if we are clear about the purpose of our model. Our model isn't no *explain how things are*, because how things are simply *is* your current experience, nothing more. Rather it is not provide a way of conceiving, in the 3rd-person, of another experience which we might adopt in the 1st-person. Our *thoughts-about* an experience are identical in nature to our *experience-of* an experience. Having formulated a pattern we desire in the 3rd-person (via the direct imagining of it) we then adopt that pattern as our experience in the 1st-person (via the direct imagining of it). There is no "method" or "technique" or "how it works" or "how things are" to this - one simply *does* this, *becomes* it.

We have to be careful with questions such as "why?", because one sort of "why?" implies a purpose, and purpose would be a *relative* truth only. But, here, I guess you mean the other sort of "why?", as in "how come

this experience not another?", and really we are reaching for the answer to the question: "how can we change this experience to one we desire?"

For that, we return to: because it is the shape we have taken on. That is, that your current patterned experience consists of the accumulation of intentions *and their implications*. And the way to change the experience is to "shape-shift" ourselves, by "intending" (increasing the intensity of contribution of one pattern, "the intention", versus the others) which amounts to "thinking it" - but not *of* it or *about* it, more like "thinking the fact *this-pattern-is-true*".

Meanwhile, the reason I wouldn't say "what is happening" is evolving, is because I'd suggest it is static between intentions, between shifts. If we shift to a new state, than that new state can have *apparent evolution* fully and deterministically defined into it, simply because it has a "time" pattern. It's completely fine to have "evolving" as part of the narrative we adopt, and to have experiences "as if" it were true - we just have to be cautious of seeing it as fundamentally true, because it implies a *process*, and the basic situation is "before" time and processes.

Okay, with all that said, we've come to the conclusions which can be partially summarised as:

- Reality == "awareness" == you == *this* whole experience
- Change == intending == shape-shifting == becoming

Which basically amounts to: "*this*".

In terms of a model, though, we can think of ourselves as a "shape-shifting material which can take on the shape of any experience/situation", knowing of course that this is an enabling metaphor and that actual situation has no inherent qualities at all other then *being-aware*.

Practically speaking, though? To make changes, it really involves a sort of "direct thinking" or "direct imagination", where we "imagine the fact that something is true or happening" and this is equivalent to *becoming* that experience. As we've discovered in our discussions, theorising about it is really the adoption of another sort of experience - to actually grasp the truth of the matter, one must *attend* to it directly, play with intending/shifting, and grasp it with a sort of *direct insight* rather than by understanding. That's why this subreddit tries to encourage people to try out a couple of "childish" exercises, and have the experiences which might lead to reconsidering one's nature and destroy the notion of something "behind" things. Actually those "childish" non-techniques *are* it, really, since experiences *are* it!

Reply to “Changing facts about objects?”

A "donut" is just an (circular) image and a (doughy) texture and a (sweet) taste and a (chewing) sound - *plus all your ideas about "donuts"* - like everything else. And so-called other people a similar collection (although "people" tend to be less chewy). All of them are experiences inside your mind - that conscious space or private view that's under your direction. So other people's assertions shouldn't be taken any more seriously than your own. The approach of assigning facts, properties and meanings to objects goes back a long way in magickal traditions and so on. Interesting to ponder: how many of the facts associated with other types of objects have you just "ended up with" by accident?

Random excerpt from a book (which I don't vouch for particularly, I just happen to have it on my drive) on Ho’oponopono, which sprang to mind:

> **Cigars, Hamburgers, and Killing the Divine**
>
> “I’ll have a double meat, double cheese burger on a white bun,” Dr. Hew Len ordered.
>
> I was stunned.That was heart attack food, in my opinion. Meat? Cheese? And a white bun? I couldn’t believe it. I also couldn’t believe that I ordered the same thing. I figured if it was good enough for the shaman it ought to be good enough for me.
>
> “Aren’t you worried about the cheese and meat and bread?” I asked him.
>
> “Not at all,”he said.“I have a chili dog every morning for break- fast. I love this stuff.”
>
> “You do?”
>
> “It’s not the food that is dangerous,” he explained to me. “It’s what you think about the food.”
>
> I had heard that comment before, but I never believed it. I fig- ured the solid trumped the thought. But maybe I was wrong.
>
> He went on to explain, “Before I eat anything, in my mind I say to the food,‘I love you! I love you! If I am bringing anything into this situation that would cause me to feel ill as I am eating you, it’s not you! It’s not even me! It’s something that triggers that I am will- ing to be responsible for!’ I then go on and enjoy the meal, because now it’s clean.”
>
> Once again his insights startled me and awakened me. I had spent so much time reading about health issues and food warnings that I was so paranoid I couldn’t enjoy a simple hamburger. I decided to clean on it.When the food arrived, we ate it with gusto.
>
> “This hamburger is the best I’ve ever had,” he announced. He was so impressed that he went and asked for the cook, and then thanked him. The cook wasn’t used to people acknowledging his deep-fried burgers.
>
> He didn’t know what to say. Neither did I.
>
> -- Excerpt from *Zero Limits*, Joe Vitale and Ihaleakala Hew Len, pp165-166

Reply to “Soemthing happened...”

Could you go into what you were doing for your *deliberate* targeting or "jumping"? This helps distinguish it from just spontaneous changes (best suited to /r/glitch_in_the_matrix, as per the sidebar rules).

Although of course, it's interesting to note that "facts" are a bit "loose" like this - and obviously the topic here capitalises on this somewhat, and the *way in which* such facts are "loose" tells us something about the nature of experience. Particularly, that "the world" isn't really structured as a series of "objects" in a "place" which unfolds in time, with us being one of those objects, as usually assumed in our default narrative. It's perhaps best conceived of as something more like a non-spatial, non-temporal "world-pattern": a sum of patterns, facts, moments, and ideas, all sort of "dissolved" into the background, and flexible because there is nothing "behind" the pattern, supporting it.

[...]

> > What do you make of the "rules" we have to live with, such as: gravity, needing to eat and drink etc. ?

If we go with the "patterning" model for this, then as you say: the basic concept would be that *all* patterns already exist, eternally. All that changes is their "relative intensity" or level of contribution to one's "state", which in turn defines one's ongoing sensory experience, all moments.

Sticking with that model:

Rules / Patterns

This "state" would not be in time - rather "time" would be another pattern, within the static state. And it has no "size", because "size" is an aspect of an experience only, while the eternally-available pattern of "spatial extent" takes up no room at all. (In the model, I think of these patterns as being sort of "dissolved into the background", with the sensory aspects of them "rippling" into ongoing experience.)

The state would only change when "shifted", and *self-shifted* at that: by intention and the extended-pattern-implications of that intention.

Note that here, we use "intention" to mean a particular pattern whose contribution is to be increased, and "intending" is the 'act' of increasing that contribution, really just by "becoming" a state with that as a fact.

Intention is the only "cause", then. All experiences are "results", including the apparent experience of "causing" things. You might say that it is all a sort of "sensory theatre", with the *you-as-awareness* being the sort of "material" from which the performance is made. The only thing that is ever truly done, therefore, is the adoption of a particular performance as a whole: no one part of a performance ever "causes" another part of it.

If no pattern is different to another pattern in its *nature*, then there is essentially no difference between "wishing" to meet an attractive partner (asserting the fact that you will meet someone, and that fact being incorporated into your existing state), and "frame-jumping" to be president (asserting the fact of a particular moment, at the Oval Office, so that it dominates and the current moment is 'overwritten'). Rules and outcomes are identical in kind.

However:

> and what is the difference with something seemingly "impossible" such as a building appearing out of nowhere ?

There are a lot of reports of that, of course, and not deliberately done.

Intention / Implication

> > Just a matter of these patterns (the "stronger" ones) being constantly reinforced, subconsciously wanted? I don't really get the difference between those and something such as continuity, which seems pretty big to me.

Well, I'd put aside the idea of a "subconscious" because that's really from another model, which involved "processes". There are no processes in this description. Nothing "happens" at all, fundamentally, other than intention; for convenience, though, we can loosen that and say that "experience" is the only thing happening.

But: right, there is no difference. So why is it that some things seem more fundamental, basic, immovable than others? (Although we should note: this stability actually seems to be quite loose, since background changes occur all the time. But *deliberate* change is what we're about here.)

I'd suggest that the issue is that "implication" aspect. Whenever you intend, that intention has meaning, and that meaning is basically the full extended pattern of the intention. An intention *implies or re-implies the worldview or metaphor from which it is constructed*. And most people don't just do a target outcome intention, they *do* something as well, with all that *that* implies. An everyday example of this would be, that many people try to "do" things using muscular tension. If they want to make a change, they do it by summoning a sense of "effort". However, that sense is part of an extended pattern which consists of certain structures as regards body, world, stability, causality, position maintenance, and so on.

Anything other than a "clean" intention, then - that is, just the raw fact-pattern with no adornment - will always have an implied pattern, and that implied pattern will inevitably be associated with the format of the current experience. "Continuity" is a pretty fundamental pattern in that sense: most acts imply a continuity to experience. So if one were to want a *discontinuous* change (one that was experienced as such), then one would have to *do nothing at all* when intending: intention sans sensory theatre.

Person / People

> > if many people reinforce a pattern, does it cause interference with the will of the one?

In this description, there are no people, in the sense of being individual objects with a consciousness who intend things. You are not a person either! If you pause and attend to your actual experience, this is pretty clear. You are that which "takes on the shape of" experiences, and it so happens that your current shape is that of apparently *being-a-person-in-a-world*. Both you and other people are static patterns (between shifts, that is) as aspects of a larger state or "world-pattern". You - meaning *you-as-awareness*, this current experience as the sum of all intentions and implications - are the only cause.

> > [Patterning] I thought this was the model used here. Are there alternatives?

Any number, really. Just as in the sidebar, there's a selection of "active metaphors" listed - different ways that you can conceive of your experience, *and can formulate intentions*. The "patterning" model is just handy

because it is probably the minimum understandable model that corresponds to a "structured" experience, without any other assumptions or limits.

> Basically, everything being a self-created masquerade. Self meaning here me-as-awareness, or awareness itself.

Yes, so, self-shaping, you might say.

The Paradox in Descriptions

> I can't help but feel a sense of paradox trying to grasp this. Having this absolute freedom and yet not having it.

Indeed. But it's the paradox only in language, the use of concepts. The root of it is that a "description" of experience is itself just another experience: the experience of "thinking about experience". You never actually get "behind" experiences; there are no "explanations" in the commonly used sense of the word. So, "the name that can be named is not the true name" is essentially us saying: "names are themselves 'made from' the thing you are trying to capture with names, which is not actually a particular 'thing' or name anyway".

A metaphor from the this comment which tries to illustrate why you can't really ever think yourself into a conceptual understanding of experience:

- ***The Beach:*** The metaphor of the beach - about metaphors. It is not possible to build a sandcastle which captures within its form both "the beach" and "sand". However, the sandcastle *is* both the beach and sand. You can certainly label one part of the sandcastle "the beach" and another "sand", but the properties of those parts, being of form, will not capture the properties of the beach and sand themselves, which are "before" form. If you forget this, and start building ("thinking") further sandcastles based on those labelled parts, all further constructions and their conclusions are immediately "wrong", fundamentally, even though they may be coherent structures ("make sense") on their own terms.

So in a way, the ultimate problem is that it is *super-simple*. It undivided, it is not a "thing" it is the subject to all things. And so, since all descriptions involve breaking things into "parts" and arranging them relative to one another in a mental space, we are immediately "wrong" when we try to describe it. Because the first thing we are doing when trying to describe something that is an undivided *subject*, is divide it and make it into two *objects* and talk about *those* instead (while still pretending we are talking about the subject).

> "dissolved in the background"... there is something quite humorous about it.

Yeah, I've always found it quite entertaining. :-)

Adding Metaphorical Layers?

> What do you think about adding a concept of layers to the ideas of intent and experience?

I'm not very keen on layers and hierarchies in the "standard" model for this, because it's important to realise that everything is at the same "level". An intention is always just a pattern, at the same level as all other patterns and the current extended pattern - and indeed *it is not separate at all*, because an intention is just the

name *for* a bit of that pattern, being increased. (And when we say "bit", well, a pattern is not actually spatial at all, but we have to make the division for conversation *somewhere!*)

Having said that: However, it *can* be useful, for conceiving of intentions, to categorise them. I had a list somewhere from another conversation - can't see it, but basically you'd have something like "event-moments, world-facts, sensory-formatting, base-formatting, abstract structuring", whatever. And this would be essentially giving a way to conceive of the idea that the fact that your experience seems divided into senses - the *fact of sense* - is itself a pattern. Also, the experience of "objects" at all, and "change" and "spatial extent", are all abstract structuring patterns.

You get the idea, because I think it's what you were probably pushing towards: that by providing a framework for thinking on top, while recognising that it is a slight move away from the basic insight, you can conceive of intending the "abstract formatting" of experience as well as the "event content" or "object content" or "world-fact content" of experience. So my simple answer for that bit is that, that's fine provided that we've already recognised that the model doesn't "explain" experience - rather it simply provides a way to conceive of a particular structuring of it, and to formulate intentions in terms of that structure (such that more cumbersome baggage is not re-intended by implication when you do).

The ultimate fact - the only fundamental fact - of course, can't be described (as we discussed above), it is directly noticed. With that in the bag, then anything goes with no caveats really!

[...]

I actually just meant that it interesting when we *notice* that things are a bit loose like this. This tends to happen once we've paying more attention to the content of our experience, and spending more time pondering this sort of topic. Probably the first online project recording "things changes sometimes!" stories was this collection, which you might find interesting (some are more relevant than others) on the *Realityshifters* website. And, of course, a subset of the posts on /r/glitch_in_the_matrix fall into this category. Anyway, here's an example from page 87 of *Realityshifters*:

> **Changing Keys / Instant Costume Change**
>
> I like your web site very much; it makes me feel far less nutty than people probably think I am. I started a thread about reality shifting back in 2001 on another board and was called a pothead. I did not know what to really call what I was experiencing at that time. The day I posted one particular reality shift story, I had woken up to find my key chain had turned gray. My boyfriend and I always had identical key chains (actually they were the lock devices that came with our Jeep), and they were both black. When one of us picked up a key ring, we had to look not at the black device but at the collection of keys, because we had the same house, similar cars and other things -- so we had to look to make sure that the gold keys to my office were on the key ring or not in order to determine which set of keys was which. One day, I woke up after a fairl hard night of half sleeping, to discover that my key locking device was now gray. My boyfriend never remembers a time when my key chain wasn't gray, and he insists that a difference in color is the way we always told our otherwise identical key chains apart, which makes me think I also do not have the exact same boyfriend anymore.

Reply to “I have attempted dimensional jumping twice now.”

Just quickly...

> > Another example of a change was that a scar on your friend's arm has disappeared, or new buildings have appeared. But really, your just noticing for the first time.

Yes, **noticing** is nice way to put it. But we must understand that the environment in which we do the noticing has (I hate to say this but let's go with it) "higher dimensionality" than we usually assume.

Definition:

- To "notice" something is to bring into perception something that was already there, but had not yet been experienced in sensory space.

The way in which something is "there but not yet experienced" is the important part. Specifically, we are not dealing with a 3D spatially-extended world which we explore - even though that is how it usually appears, so quick are we to "fill in the gaps" as we go. If we suddenly notice a book on our bookshelf which we haven't seen before, was that book always there? Yes, in some way. However, in order to see it we had to adjust our angle to the world. So, the effect can be both mundane and continuous, or dramatic and discontinuous, depending.

[...]

There's no such thing as a "dimension" other than as a concept. Mind you, there's no such thing as "space" or "time" other than as concepts either (they are bad habits).

You can't literally change dimension, but you can't literally move in (conceptual) time or space either. What you *can* do is leverage concepts to trigger a change in ongoing experience, in perhaps surprising ways.

I don't think this subreddit actually has a purpose other than supporting personal experimentation into the limits of how experience can be changed. It doesn't even have a worldview other than maybe "experience = fact, results = truth". That's why the sidebar isn't prescriptive.

So don't feel obligated to take on the burden of explaining things to people, I reckon; it's for them to explore the world on their own terms I think! In my own view, people shouldn't actually "believe" anything - including anything about themselves. Until we do an experiment, we don't know anything, we are just recycling thoughts.

Reply to “Two mirrors report.”

Yeah, it's all good. The main idea here is that there is no particular underlying "how it is". So if the many worlds metaphor is something you find fits your thinking, great. But: If you then have experiences or encounter concepts which don't fit into that model, or have questions which are nonsensical from within that framework, it's useful to remind ourselves that it *is* a model - a "parallel description in thought". It's not actually "how things work". In fact "things", in and of themselves, are in a separate strand of experience (albeit within the same "space").

However, there's a twist. Because "the world" and your thoughts *about* the world arise in the same space, there is a crossover, in the sense that adopting a particular metaphor can result in a "patterning" of your "space". This tends to result you having experiences arise "as if" your metaphor were true. Hence the use of the term "Active Metaphors" in the sidebar. (And also: the possibility of developing paranoia and obsession if you get too focused and don't realise what is happening!)

[...]

> A: This isn't /r/nosleep guys, suspension of disbelief isn't a rule, we can be skeptical and tell OP he's full of it... This is like the biggest jump ever, might aswell you jump into a universe you are a billionaire OP...

Indeed. **Skepticism in its true sense**; exploring and investigating and contemplating is what this is about. "How, *exactly*...?" is the thought process we use.

Reply to “I Helped A Beautiful Soul”

That all sounds nice but - how *exactly* does one "cast out the negativity enough" and "keep positive" and so on? Which isn't to say that kind words and encouragement aren't good, of course! *However*, the underlying point of something like the *Two Glasses Exercise* as originally conceived of is that it circumvents the need for such things, and allows us to both avoid the superstitious hand-waving vague hoping-praying that comes with lots of "spiritual" things, while also giving us an insight into the nature of experience (and ourselves).

Rolling back into standard "new agery" and its non-specific terms takes us back to that unstructured place, potentially, and the vulnerability and dependence on others that goes with it. So I'm particularly wary of it, especially in this subreddit. The entire point is to help people explore and take charge of their own experience (and there to be no other authority than themselves, ultimately).

> > I've said before, the two glasses method tends to not work for people that have a very "realistic" view of the world...

I both agree and disagree.

If you have a "realistic view of the world" (loosely speaking, there is a lot to unpack in such a phrase) that might be said to limit the experiences one might have that are symbolic or dreamlike or discontinuous.

However, *Two Glasses* doesn't attempt this. In terms of one's experience, the outcomes that arise will apparently come by "plausible, albeit extremely unlikely" routes. Which is why, as a "demo exercise", it's encouraged that one repeats the exercise many times with different targets to demonstrate a correlation between it and getting a result (rather than it being coincidence). It leverages pre-existing patterns that everyone has, as part of the world in its everyday form. What's more important, there, is that one follows the final instruction - "carry on with your life" - so as not to counter-intend the effective outcome of "it is true *now* that this happens *then*" which can be said to occur at the moment of the exercise (because it is a *direct* operation).

> > Fear and skepticism must be transmuted to faith if one wishes to truly move mountains.

Okay, but this is a little bit woolly, and woolliness (which many approaches and descriptions suffer from, "law of attraction" and so on especially) can lead to problems. How, *exactly*, does "mediations, hypnosis, EFT" bring about a "transmutation" of fear into faith.

And even more to the point: Why does fear or faith matter? Are they problematic *in and of themselves*, or is it rather something which such feelings might lead to? What is "negativity" exactly, and why would it make any difference to anything?

> > This is why we can perform the two glasses method and simply state "the act is the fact"

The title doesn't come from that notion, I should clarify. One doesn't state anything when performing the exercise. In fact, it is a problem if one tries to "do" the exercise - that is, "try" to bring about the result - rather than simply perform the actions, via intention of the actions themselves. "The act is the fact" because *all* intentional acts are direct facts - and there is no intermediary.

Which loops us back, of course, to the main themes we must tackle if we are to avoid woolliness and vague or superstitious behaviour: the questions of what is the nature of "you", of "experiencing" and of "descriptions"?

If we are in the game of "transmutation", for example, then it behooves us to explore, to clarify, what exactly it is that we are "transmuting" - and why - and why a particular activity may, or may not, bring about such a thing. (Ultimately, for sure, since descriptions are "parallel" then there is no way to truly get "behind" this - which is sort of the point - but since models format intentions, it is important to be as detailed as possible.)

Reply to “Witch needs help re: unintended consequences”

> >Can you please just help me understand why no one here promotes using safety clauses.

We *have* had discussions in the past about being specific, particularly when someone has come up with a "monkey paw" type hypothesis. Ultimately, the generalised version of how to view this here would probably be that it's best to view things as a "dumb patterning system". That is, there is no interpretation of your target outcome taking place, there is in intermediary entity or intelligence. Rather, you are literally and directly increasing the prominence of the fact/pattern that you are intending, and the rest of the "landscape" of your world-definition is simply being deformed as a side-effect.

And so, yes, being specific is generally helpful, or appending some sort of notion of "in a way that benefits everyone" or whatever. One strategy someone came up with for the *Two Glasses* exercise was to add an asterisk (" * ") beside the labels, as if indicating an internal footnote, and *just-decide* that doing so meant that the manner of the outcome would be beneficial in a broader sense.

It's worth noting something else here: that is, that the way some of these exercises were designed, was that it's not so much about the *actual words* you write, rather it's the *state* they represent or are a handle on. For example, in the *Two Glasses*, you are not writing a description of your outcome, you are summoning the outcome in your mind and then retrieving a "handle" onto that, which you then write onto the label, linking it to the state. If you are doing that with full attention, then you are inherently specifying your outcome state in a way that is more complete than simply words or other symbols.

So, there's a bit more to consider here, potentially, than just the general notion of "safety clauses". And obviously there's a whole lot of stuff to unpack about concepts like "forces of the universe" and so on. The approach here is (amongst other things) aimed at unpacking and defusing such patterns, and in the process I'd say that there's less to worry about as regards unintended outcomes from assumptions, since intentions are more "direct". Of course, almost *all* of an outcome could be said to "unintended", strictly speaking. (As in: not specified. Because if you intend an outcome - say, passing an exam - then "passing an exam" is just one little fact, but the whole landscape of your state was deformed to accommodate it. In that way, almost all of the outcome or result, almost all of your landscape, was not deliberate.)

Reply to “Two Glasses - A Cautionary Tale”

It's important to be careful to not get too hung up on any "monkey paw" type notions here - that is, the idea that there is some sort of payment extracted for having an intentional outcome arise. What you say here isn't a bad way to phrase it:

> >Cause it's all about the "path of least resistance".

However - it's not necessarily the "path of least resistance" in terms of how you yourself would narrate or conceive of your situation. The way in which your outcomes (seem to) arise isn't necessarily dictated by "story" type logic; it's more like dream or "patterning" type logic. The whole thing is more like a direct "dumb patterning system".

Which is to say: If you intend an outcome, then it's like you have asserted a particular fact to be true: the fact of *this-outcome* at *that-moment*. The two certainties, right then, are that *this-moment* is true (because you are experiencing it) and that *that-moment* is true (because you are "pseudo-experiencing" it by defining it). If we conceive of our state (the set of all facts and the sequence of "sensory moments" which are implied by them) as a sort of "landscape", then it's like you have defined two particular landscape features, - like mountains or valleys or trees or rocks - one "now" and one "then". And so, just from the fact that the landscape is continuous, the intermediary ground that is the moments between "now" and "then" are defined implicitly. This is "dumb", or happens "stupidly", since there is no calculation or intelligence involved, any more than pulling on one side of a blanket results in a calculation which reforms all the folds and creases in the material. And the way in which the blanket reshapes does not necessarily correspond to any narrative we have about the current set of folds. That is, the rules of "folds in blankets" do not necessarily match up with the rules of "stories about pictures made from folds".

All of which leads to: yes, we might say that outcomes arise by the "path of least resistance", but the sort of "path" we are talking about doesn't necessarily correspond to our conception of what a "path" would be. In fact, the rules of "folds in blankets" would be "before" conceptualisation; they are literally unthinkable. So there's not much point in worry about that (because you wouldn't actually be worry about the thing you should be worrying about, anyway). The "story path" of an outcome really only an observation you make in retrospect, when it's too late. Fortunately, though, all of this is easily solved. If our worry is that the "outcome fact" will bring with it circumstances which are unappealing to us, we can simply include within our definition of the "outcome fact" that it *will* be appealing to us. From the other discussion:

And so, yes, being specific is generally helpful, or appending some sort of notion of "in a way that benefits everyone" or whatever. One strategy someone came up with for the *Two Glasses* exercise was to add an asterisk (" * ") beside the labels, as if indicating an internal footnote, and *just-decide* that doing so meant that the manner of the outcome would be beneficial in a broader sense.

The takeaway of all of this, I'd say, is the realisation that there is no intermediary between you and the intention and the outcome. They are all identical: intending is basically a "reshaping" of yourself into a new state, by yourself. The more specific you are, the more specific your subsequent experience. If you are not specific, then the intention is effectively "auto-completed" via triggering of the extended pattern of your intention (that is, simply due to its "dumb" incorporation into features of the current state or landscape at the time).

Importantly, there is no "universe" or other entity interpreting requests or whatever, or sending you messages. Although you could intend to have experiences "as if" that were true, of course - but you would still be doing so *directly*.

Additional thought - It's also worth noting that the correct attitude isn't really: "if I intend something, then what if a bad thing happens as an unintended consequence?". Because if you never intend anything, you are not actually avoiding unintended consequences. Rather, your *entire experience* is an "unintended consequence"! You are deciding to accept however the "landscape" happens to have ended up by this point. So I suppose it's really about a transition towards taking responsibility for your experience, rather than not. And part of that is to understand and accept the limitations of knowledge as regards experiential *content*. There is an inherent "mystery" here: you can't pre-experience your experiences, and they aren't really "experiences" until you have experienced them.

> >[“there is no intermediary between you and the intention and the outcome.”] If we all had our “houses in order”, I would agree.

I think it applies regardless, and that's actually partly what's being said by it.

To muse on that for a bit: What I mean here is, that there's never a *structural* or *active* intermediary; there are no levels. The lack of order in your "house", is just a part of your current state, at the same level as any other pattern. The only thing there is to change, is the patterning of your state, directly (with no intermediary), even when *in terms of a particular conceptual model* that pattern would be described "as if" it were some sort of boundary or entity. Someone might, say, describe their process as "sending a message to god", and have outcomes consistent with there being a god. What "really" happened was that they shifted their state such that "outcome" was overlaid onto their existing "fact-pattern landscape" - and "outcome" was structured *in terms of* the pattern "god" and "message" and "response". The intention for the outcome was *also, implicitly* an intention for a "god message" experience. The subsequent "outcome-experience" then arises with content "as if" these things existed as intermediaries.

The "outcome" is incorporated into existing patterning; a deformation of the existing overall pattern, and the "outcome" itself is defined in terms of a particular patterning. So at the fundamental level of "*you-as-awareness* in a patterned state", there is no intermediary, simply because there are fundamentally no "parts", just one "landscape" (you, in a particular "shape"). The state of your "house" is identical with the state of you, and there's nothing outside of that, hence nowhere for intermediaries to be.

Hence "dumb patterning system" and *all* change being "direct". Or: it's patterns all the way down, and there isn't a "down" really, because "down" is a pattern too...

> >However, I've noticed you don't really discuss belief systems and definitions.

Hmm. So, what would you say a "belief system" *is?*

I feel that as as concepts, "beliefs" and "belief systems" can be a bit tricky, they are sort of quite hand-waving notions. There's this lack of clarity between "believing" or "belief systems" as an experience, as *content* of thought for example, and as the "meta" structuring or *context* of one's experience, what we've been calling our "state".

In the view we've been exploring about, I'm not sure that the concepts are needed. Would we just be including them again from familiarity, from habit? In what sense do we actually experience a "belief" as such? And is it perhaps a partial idea which arose from a different model, an idea which doesn't translate easily or usefully?

> >Yes, the patterning system is dumb and it's steered by an even dumber set of generally unchecked notions about "life, the universe and everything".

Following on from the last bit, I think we have to make a distinction, perhaps, between "notions" as something one experiences thinking or inferring are at the root of thinking, versus the actual structuring of our experience.

There's a hidden assumption here, perhaps, which is: that the format of our thoughts corresponds in type to the format of our state. That is, that descriptions somehow get "behind" experience, when in fact descriptions are *themselves* just further experiences, at the same level: the experience of "thinking about [a concept called] experience". There *is* no "behind the scenes".

> >Am I saying one should be afraid to explore their own mind/dreamscape?

Only in the same sense that one would be scared to explore their own thoughts, I suppose!

> >I'm saying one should... have a decent grip on how their own mind works, why they want what they want...

I definitely agree that it's quite fundamental to explore one's current state, and from that proceed accordingly.

No matter what, though, you can only do this by actually experiencing your state. That can be in thought ("feeling out" your landscape in direct contemplation) or in the main strand (your ongoing "sensory" experience). So it's a funny sort of thing, that there is no "outside" position one can take. There's no way to "do something and *then* experience selected patterns", because the way that you select the patterns *is itself* by implicitly selecting patterns.

So you are *always* exploring your current state, in fact!

The choice you make, though, is whether to *intensify* (increase the relative contribution of) a particular pattern, once you have unpacked it in some form or other (as a thought or as a main strand).

So, it's all a bit like a rippling of self? Unfolding and refolding different aspects, electing to keep some aspects unfolded and contributing after having encountered them in our investigations, others less so. The main thing being that we can't actually "pre-decide" that we want a particular pattern in advance - we have to experience it in *some way* before it is available to us to choose to persist it or not.

We're basically in agreement throughout; it's mostly terminology. As with a lot of these conversations, half of what we're doing is digging into terms to make sure we mean the same things by them - so we can then confirm we were agreeing anyway. I'd only pick up on this bit:

> > [Hence "dumb patterning system" and all change being "direct"] I'm simply pointing out that it's something most people will never get to truly experience for themselves.

In terms of what the description is pointing to, though, *all* experiences are that experience, and all intentional change is that. The *extent of change* (how unusual it is in comparison with the everyday-world description) doesn't matter; that would be a difference in specific content, not in type.

And:

> >For me, descriptions and definitions sort of generate and organize experiences while, indeed, being experiences (patterns) themselves.

I'd clarify this and say that *if an intention is structured in terms of a description or conceptual framework*, then it could be said that the description "generates and organises" experiences. That's the difference between a description as an "experience of thinking about something" and a description as "a shaper of experience". (Now, I would agree that there's some deformation that can occur just by thinking about a description, but it's relatively negligible, might lead to broad synchronicity.)

This is where we get into the idea of extended patterns and *meaning*, and the view that there really is only one continuous overall pattern or shape, consisting of all possible patterns; there are no "parts". Each intentional pattern, then, essentially implies a whole world, and intending is therefore a shift of the entire world-pattern. This doesn't involve explicit formulation.

To be less vague, if you kneel down and pray, then that act already has a full meaning and implied structure beyond simply the request, which is then part of the extended pattern of the intention - regardless of what you think about it, or whether you have thought about it.

Now, for that example there is some overlap with the idea of "belief systems" I suppose, but: More abstractly, even just conceiving of a desire in terms of an object, already implies a certain structure to the "format" of the world (a "place", spatially-extended and unfolding in time, and so on) which in turn implies a certain structure to the resulting experience. And so, the intention for the object is also in effect an intention of a "place"-type world, and "place"-type experiences, since the "meaning" of the intentional pattern *is* its extended pattern in those terms.

Reply to “Questions for Mr. TriumphantGeorge about reality tunnels, non-dual doctrines, books and movies.”

> Those experiences made me realize that this "material" world is an echo of the "imaginal" world.

I feel that if we take a step back from that, and instead view all experiences as being at the same level, we can short-circuit some of the usual paths of thinking here. So, no one aspect of experience is an echo of anything else; they are just aspects of your current "state". One moment or strand does not cause another; rather they are part of the same "place". In this way, we sidestep the concepts of "belief" or "projection", both of which imply some sort of separation between "you" and "world" plus some sort of intermediary mechanism, and end up with a description based around you as *that-which-is-aware* sort of "taking on the shape of" states of experience, by a shifting of self. Basically, a "patterning" of *you-as-awareness*.

Loosely speaking, that corresponds to something along the lines of:

- What you truly are is a non-material "material" whose only inherent property is *being-aware* (or "awareness"), and which "takes on the shape of" states of experience. Right now, *you-as-awareness* is "patterned" as a state which corresponds to the experience of apparently being (an experience "as if" you were; consistent with a description of being) a *person-object* located within a *world-place*. However, by attending directly to one's ongoing experience, one can recognise that the *context* of our experiences in *general* does not correspond to any of the descriptions we have about the *content* of *specific* experience. (Something like that, anyway.)

This, I'd say, is effectively another depiction of "non-duality", but employing metaphors that are stripped down, attempting to avoid old associations whose original meanings have become corrupted (e.g. "god" or even "consciousness"), or getting ensnared in modern metaphors that don't quite fit (e.g. "simulations" or misused "quantum states"). In the end, thought, as with those descriptions, it becomes about pointing out and avoiding saying things that are "wrong", rather than being able to say the thing that is "right".

Reply to “Mr. Goddard's movie-reel analogy”

In terms of intentional outcomes, we can adapt it to illustrate how the movie reel is defined in the first place, perhaps: If you intend an outcome, then two moments (or "movie frames") are at that point fully defined: that is, the current moment (because you are experiencing as fact now, "viewing" it), and the target moment (which you are asserting as being "true now, then"). Since the landscape of experience is continuous - that is, a movie story is always coherent - defining two points inherently implies the moments between "now" and "then" as a side-effect. The content of those intermediary moments is, in a way, irrelevant to the end-point experience, since one moment does not cause the next moment - instead, all moments are a result of that intention. The outcome is assured, in this description; the apparent path merely a sort of collateral shaping, a sequence of 3D multi-sensory images that have been implied spontaneously by two frames at either end being specified.

Reply to “Which method to use to achieve future goal?”

Just for super clarity, I'd probably highlight issues with the use of "unconsciously" with the word "choosing", because of how loaded that term is, and how varied its uses. It's easier, I think, to reserve "choices" for intentions, where "intending" means deliberate selection and intensification of a pattern to make it relatively more prominent in our experience ("the intention"). I'd perhaps strip it back to simply: we can intend outcomes or facts - shift ourselves - but sometimes the extended pattern implied by those intentions is not anticipated.

For example, you might react to an encounter with someone you like but are shy of by intending them to "go away"; and they do. You *could* say that you "unconsciously chose" to make it so you never have a relationship with that person, but I think that doesn't really capture what's actually going on. "The unconscious" is a problem because people tend to think of it as both a place and a process, somehow separate from ongoing experience, but which has a mind of its own and does things - whereas it's really just a way of saying "aspects of your current patterning which are not unpacked into this expanded sensory moment", like Bohm's ink droplet analogy.

***You* are the only mind**, and the state of your world is a static landscape that cannot shift unless you shift it/yourself. *You* are the only thing that "happens". So, "unconscious" in the sense of not being explicitly aware of what we have done - not having a thought *about* that - but not in the sense of there being something "happening" behind the scenes.

But then, of course, *our entire state right now* is of that "unpacked" type. Our current patterning is, other than this current "sensory moment", in the background rather then unfolded into explicit knowing (=experience). Only the current "sensory moment" or an explicitly chosen intention, while being intended or recalled, are not of that type.

> > Perhaps it's a better term to use overall, but it only makes sense if you truly know what you're doing.

The problem is, when we begin with these terms we've already created a hurdle for understanding it properly. "Conscious-unconscious", given that people tend to conceive of these things as "happening" independently in some sense, is already built upon an error and rich with unhelpful associations, some of which are very difficult to point out, to the extent that it's better to put them aside. Of course, in casual conversation, unlike here, then we start with whatever way in might be easiest, and then try to lead things around. But at some point, inevitably, you have to just assert the viewpoint - either by asserting that there is such a thing as "intention" and building out, or by leading them through an exercise like *Feeling Out* and so on - and build out from that, as a parallel picture of things.

In these conversations, naturally, we're all about digging into these things, and I'm not particularly aiming at generating snappy few-liner descriptions that can be given to people without establishing a background first. However, a side effect of this tends to be the generation of new metaphors which *can* be helpful in that area.

> > Why would negative feelings arise if that's not what I'm focusing on anymore?

They are aspects of your current state, which will always have some patterning from previous intentions and implications - which typically become less conspicuous over time. (Remember, here, that the state is static, so

more accurately they don't "become" less conspicuous, it's just true *now* that the pattern is less dominant across the static set of moments.)

With *passing* thoughts and feelings, then, just let them be and they'll just be left behind. Wrestling with the content of every moment is a sure way to get into trouble. If a thought or feeling *persists*, then intend the desired feeling. And, again, let *it* be too. You are not meant to be managing your ongoing experience in some sort of constant maintenance mode.

> so it does seem like this could improve drastically as I keep putting more focus into it.

I'd say it's not *necessarily* about "putting focus into" so much as "do not subsequently interfere" - depending on what is meant by that ("putting focus"). This is something to experiment with a bit, but since your intentional reactions to surroundings can be in terms of a depressed state, you can end up recreating it. After which, when you notice this has occurred, you can re-intend feeling good again of course – but: I'd like to caution against "keeping focused on" in some sort of ongoing sense, like a "forcing" more than simple one-hit "decisions". This can become another version of holding yourself in a fixed position *in opposition to* the moments that you have defined in your state previously. Intention can best be considered as as "redirection" or "assertion", not as a process that needs maintenance, otherwise you are in fact holding a moment, rather than modifying your state while avoiding obstructing the unfolding of your sensory experience.

"Putting focus into" in the sense of "intending when I notice that I have counter-intended" is perfectly fine, of course.

[...]

It's fine to invoke any concept, but we just have to be more careful than we would when discussing other topics - because in this case the thing we are discussing is also about *the nature of concepts* (or descriptions). Every concept comes with baggage, and accumulates more over time. Worse - "God" being a classic one, but "consciousness" too - many concepts turn out to be sort of meaningless, because we tend not to take the time to define them. (For example, reading "consciousness explained" type articles is often fascinating, because usually - inevitably - the article turns out to be about *this other thing*, but with it being labeled "consciousness".)

As you pointed out earlier, though, this just means we need to engage in a dialogue to whittle down what exactly we mean by the terms we are using. And I do think that, if we introduce the "meta" idea of "experiencing" as being independent of, the *context* to, any *content*, then we've always got a platform we can retreat to in order to regain our footing.

Anyway - There's probably an interesting point to be made about whether or not to treat any content as "important" (or as "signs"). It's best to treat them just as they are actually experienced: multi-sensory 3D imagery, within awareness, with a feeling of "meaning" with it. Any further interpretation is itself a further experience: the experience of "thinking about" that experience.

Meanwhile, if you don't regularly re-imply something, then the pattern tends to fade, simply because *other* intentions towards desired "fact-patterns" will tend to imply the reduced contribution of that something, simply as part of the world-experience being fairly consistent. As I say, though, there's nothing wrong with regularly intending "being happy" or whatever, but this is not the same as manipulating or maintaining the

ongoing sensory moment. It is more like "asserting a fact" into the background of experience, such that subsequent sensory moments arise in alignment with that, later.

The total simplicity of this does, ironically, lead to lots of verbiage in an attempt to capture it. Ultimately, we are talking about an undivided non-thing - but since words and concepts require division (that is, the breaking up of things into "parts" and then relating them within a "conceptual space"), we immediately create an error even in the attempt to capture it (if we are talking in terms of divisions, we are already *not* talking about the undivided thing), and flip from zero complexity to endless complexity.

Trying to talk about "awareness" suffers from this. It's not a *thing* at all, and nor is it even the material that things are made from, although that's still a useful metaphor. The concept "awareness" is immediately inaccurate, because simply the fact of dealing with a concept means we aren't talking about *awareness-as-it-is*, which is "before" concepts.

And talking about "intention" suffers from the same issue. Intention is not about entertaining thoughts or feelings or whatever. Intention is *the reshaping of oneself, by oneself*. "Entertaining thoughts" is a *result* - an experience. So it cannot be a *cause*. Experiences are *results* of intention, so if we find ourselves talking about something to "do", we are already talking about something other than intention.

It's actually better to start with the concept of a "state" and have intention simply be a modification of the state, with sensory experiences being aspects of the current state. That way, you have a nice clear model:

You are "awareness". The only inherent property of "awareness" is *being-aware*. Awareness contains all possible patterns, eternally. Awareness can be in a "state" where some patterns are more prominent than others. Your ongoing sensory experience is the sensory aspect of that "state". "Intending" is the name given to increasing the relative prominence of a pattern ("the intention") in your state, such that ongoing sensory experience reflects that (because it just *is* an aspect of that patterned state). All experiences are *results*. The only *cause* is the state/intention.

Of course, this inherently means that neither "awareness" nor "intending" can be described, since descriptions are themselves experiential patterns, and are "made from" awareness. Just like you can't build a sandcastle which is the shape of "the beach" and "sand", even though the sandcastle *is* both "the beach" and "sand". (And if you make sandcastles and label them "the beach" and "sand", they are still not those things, although it is likely we will get confused and start treating them as such. Which loops back to where we came in, with our unpicking of terms in order to be certain we meant what we think we meant.)

It's not really passive, though, although I get that the language seems to suggest it.

Saying that the only inherent property is *being-aware* is just to say that the "shape" of it is always inherently an experience. It can then causelessly *shape-shift* itself into any experience (but don't conflate experience with the current "expanded sensory moment" only; something I keep accidentally implying I must admit).

Sometimes, as a brief mental image even though it slightly misleads, I refer to "awareness" as:

- "The non-material material whose only inherent property is *being-aware* and which 'takes on the shape of' states and experiences; right now it has 'taken on the shape of' apparently *being-a-person-object-in-a-world-place*".

Which is more suggestive of the complete idea. Implicit in this description is that all possible patterns are present eternally, are always available, and it's a matter of the "relative intensity of contribution" rather than their existence as such.

Following from that, then: "intending" is the reshaping of *you-as-awareness* such that a given pattern ("the intention") becomes more prominent in its contribution to ongoing experience; "volition" would be a little bit of experiential or imagination theatre whereby you browse patterns and select one to then adopt more fully.

As always, we should highlight that experience just *is* and there's nothing "behind" is - and that includes this description, which is itself just an experience (an experience of "thinking about experience"). So, the description doesn't get "behind" experience or "explain" experience, however it provides a framework for thinking about the essence of a structured experience independent of specific content - it is closer to the "basic experience" - and is useful as a platform for formulating intentions "as if" it were true (which of course intensifies the apparent truth of the description, because whatever patterns an intention is asserted *in terms of*, is also brought into prominence, as part of its extended pattern).

To avoid going astray, though, so that we don't start thinking that this is "how it really works" or gives us a method or mechanism, we keep re-iterating that the only fundamental truth is the fact of "awareness", and *all* other aspects of experience are relatively true (patterning, temporarily) only.

> The shape-shifting metaphor makes passivity go away, but the adverb "causelessly" seems to bring it back.

The issue here is one of language, again. Language requires that there be a "doer", a "doing", a "done". You can't really describe "movement" without it sounding passive unless you invoke a "mover" - but in this case we are talking about *self-shaping* or *self-movement*, with no "mover" distinct from the "movement", because of course you are the entirety of the experience.

As an attempt to illustrate this: move your arm. Attend to the experience. Do "you" actually "move" your arm, or does the experience of "my arm moving' simply arise? In what sense do you "cause" your arm to move? If you have an experience of "doing" the movement, then what causes *that* experience? Is it not itself a causeless experience, in terms of there being something within your experience that makes the arm move? Is it not the case that the entirety of your ongoing experience is a "result" and not a "cause"? Something to play with, anyway.

> So, there's nothing "behind" it, but maybe there is something inside it.

Again, this is perhaps best viewed as an issue with language and conceptual thinking - which always involves arranging *object-ideas* within a *conceptual space*, almost like as sort of imaginary "thinking room". There are in fact no hierarchies or locations in what we're talking about here, but there's actually no way to talk about this, since thinking requires division and relation, which is "after" this.

So, really, we must simply accept that we are using metaphors to point to *aspects* of our experience, and sometimes those metaphors will apparently even clash or contradict one another in the details because they are all "wrong" to an extent. The descriptions we are using aren't "explanations" for our experience, they are our best attempts to communicate insights that are observed. "How things are" is never captured by the description, never *are* them; the descriptions merely point to them.

The implicate/explicate orders are one useful image, certainly. But: the implicate order is not actually intended to be spatially located at all, since it is "before" even the formatting pattern of "spatiality". It is useful to refer to it as "enfolded within" our experience, because it gives a sense of the relationship, but the spatial metaphor is not really accurate (since only *spatially-extended experiential content* has spatial extent and this is not that).

Similarly, the "patterning" model tries to use the concept of patterns or ripples, all existing simultaneously and summing up to a state. A bit like Moire fringes. The idea here is to use the minimum required concepts to represent a structured experience, whilst avoiding invoking spatial or temporal metaphors as much as possible. The "sensory aspect" is the current "unfolded" part of that total image, in this description: sensory experience is spatial, but patterns themselves are not. But again, that description is not "true" because no description can be; it is simply an attempt to capture certain aspects of experience such that they can be discussed and, then, used as formulations for intentions.

The summary, then: Experience is *as it is* and is primary; descriptions are pointers to that and are themselves experiences, so it is not possible to have a model which *is* experience. There is actually no "how things are" or "mechanism" or "structure" which is inherent. Models are meant to be "effective" (that is: useful) rather than "true", so arguing about the models can sometimes be a distraction, and that's why the sidebar encourages conducting experiments.

Aside - Models are never "true" even outside of this more "meta" analysis, although unfortunately they are often presented as such at the moment by many people who really should know better. Even in the standard description, the world is not actually, say, made from "atoms". That model was never intended to capture "what is really happening"; it is simply a useful - "effective" - description for many purposes. "The atomic world" (a certain conceptual framework) is made from "atoms", but *the-world-as-it-is*, experience, is not.

Reply to “Isn't this too good to be true?”

> >Basically, the theory is that your subconscious mind is creating the universe that you perceive.

Well, not quite. What *exactly* is a "subconscious" and why would it need to be convinced of anything - what power can it have to manifest things in your "reality"? I think it is worth considering that the idea of "the subconscious" is a needless conceptual filler: it is never actually observed, its introduction does not actually explain anything, and it has no link to our direct experience. It also presupposes some sort of division between "you" and "the world" and an intermediary or "mechanism" that operates in the background, unobserved. It's not clear that this is justified.

> >All of this is conjecture of course.

Yes, that's the theory - and nicely described, too! But then, to what extent does it connect to our actual experiences? Isn't it just a placeholder or conceptual connective tissue to join up what is experienced sensorily? That is, is it perhaps more of a "story" or a "language" than it is an accurate explanation of our actual experiences - particularly for our current topic of discussion: experiencing changes in the world which apparently break our standard description of it as a "place"?

The number of "observational touch-points" that connect the idea of the subconscious to our lived experience seem few, to the extent where it might be better not to invoke it at all, especially when it takes the form of a pseudo-computer-programming analogy (as it tends to do these days). I guess I'm saying that I see no reason to *believe* in the concept as "true", although one might find it a useful way to *talk about* things (while remaining aware that it is not what is "really happening"). It's the crossing of that line that I find perhaps unhelpful - again, particularly in the current context, for various reasons. It all hinges on what exactly you think "you" are, and what the relationship between "you" and "the world" is, of course. For example, I'd suggest that we can't simultaneously invoke a psychologist's idea of "the subconscious" and also the law of attraction type idea of "the subconscious", since they would require different notions of "you" and "the world".

Sort of related: I quite enjoyed this article about Freud recently. An extract:

> *Freud believed that all cognitive processes are unconscious.* What we call ‘conscious thought’ is just the brain’s way of displaying the output of unconscious cognitive processing to itself.

Now, from that I'd probably suggest deleting the notion of "the brain" or "processing" (these are never observed), and simply say that conscious thought *is*. All the rest of it comes about because we make the error of thinking that all experience must be expanded out into objects, or it isn't there. Unconscious thought - or "the subconscious" - isn't unconscious at all. It is here, now, in experience as an "awareness context": but you might say it is enfolded or "dissolved" into and as the background, rather than unfolded or "expanded" into the foreground. However, that means it doesn't "happen" or "process" anything or do any thinking - it is more like a static landscape or state with sensory experience an *aspect* of it, with nothing outside of that, and it is not *personal*.

[...]

[7kek7: The nature of this forum is to get your own under standing of "reality" or experience. There is no right answer. In my experience I have the ability to ponder that which we call life and the world and I prefer it that way. Perhaps that's why it is as such.]

Reply to “Isn't this magick/chaos magic but a different interpretation?”

> [Q: Magic/magick - "the Science and Art of causing Change to occur in conformity with Will".
>
> Magic works on the basis that you can manipulate the probability something will happen with focused intent and will (with gnosis/meditation etc). It's all the same dimension but you can cause fluctuations in reality and what will occur in future by magic. So you end up with a different version of your reality that you're manipulating. Is that not the same as willing a different dimension in a ritual (mirror gazing is one) with intentions in mind to manifest to see changes and then them happening without any other explanation for it except it worked?
>
> If not how is this different (genuinely curious not trying to point out it isn't, just curious after reading some of this sub after ending up here through some reddit rabbit hole that began in my usual occult hang out).]

We might ask, what *is* magick, exactly? Well, "magick" is just the name of a particular description, an idea about experience and the world. The *world-as-it-is* remains the same, regardless. So possibly what we are really asking is, is the description called "magick" the same as the description called "dimensional jumping"? And then: how do those descriptions relate to the "nature of experiencing"?

This last question is, ultimately, what the subreddit ends up being about. This might lead us to question our identity as a "person", to create new metaphors to better describe experience, and to explore more deeply what "you" are, what "the world" is, what the relationship between the two might be, and how this relates to the content of experience and the possibility of change. That's why the sidebar contains different metaphors, and the exercises are described as "demo exercises", rather than being some being screed about "inter-dimensional travel" or whatever: ‘The essence of Dimensional Jumping is the leveraging of perspective-structuring metaphors and the techniques derived from them’.

Obviously, if there is a "nature" to "experience" at all, then *all* experiences and *all* redirections of its present path (changes of state) are of the same type, however described: magick, law of attraction, dimensional jumping, raising your arm, thinking of a tree are all the same thing. This also means that our problem with understanding them might be that we have not properly examined the nature of *descriptions*. Perhaps they are best thought of as "patterns" that can be *applied* to our ongoing experience, rather than "explanations" that *account for* it. It may even be that there is no fixed "how things work" at all, but that operating according to a given explanation, intending *in terms of* a description, results in experiences "as if" that explanation were true.

So "magick" and "dimensional jumping" are the same in the sense that they are both possible descriptions of (an apparent) "how things work", and descriptions are things which can be applied for desired effect. But really there are no "dimensions" other than the idea and the experiences "as if" they were true; just as there are no "probabilities" to manipulate in order to choose a "future" either. They are best thought of at a meta level, therefore - of being "patterns or formatting which can be adopted by direct intention or by implication".

Reply to “Isn't this just a form of "magick"? Be careful.”

Why, exactly, do you believe any of those statements, though? One might ponder what you mean by "magick". And also consider whether you are, perhaps unintentionally, being somewhat superstitious or scare-mongering. Even the idea of "selfishness" can be a tricky concept, once you start looking at what, exactly, the "you" is that would be selfish in this context.

> [Q: I believe there is no good magic. I believe that is a deception. Reasons
>
> 1) Experiencing magic firsthand... 2) Spiritual reasons.]

What do you mean by "spiritual reasons"? What is "spiritual"? And a "deception" *by whom?* There are potentially a lot of hidden assumptions in these terms, which we have to dig into; they can't be accepted at face value. To be clear, though, this subreddit is *not* about doing "magick", or "reality-shifting" or whatever, *as such*. It's ultimately about investigating the "nature of experience", and indeed the nature of *descriptions about* experience. Pursuing this, it might be found that the idea of "magick" - depending on what you mean by that - and specifically magick being "good" or "bad", is in a sense sort of meaningless, from a broader perspective.

The implication of statements like "there is no good magick" is that there is some sort of proper "how things should be". That is, a normal order of things which shouldn't be interfered with or else you get "punished". In fact, though, the very idea of a "you" might not hold up to scrutiny. And so on. As I say, this all depends on what exactly you are talking about.

[...]

First, I would ask: why are you taking that seriously, and at face value, particularly? That is, unless you have taken some of the quotes and really thought deeply into them - in which case you could respond with more detailed reasoning of your own, based on that, rather than just linking to some quotes. Otherwise you are at risk of simply recycling superstitions, not reasons.

Second - and just linking to some quotes, for now, heh! - I'd note that one of the authors people often refer to in this subreddit, Neville Goddard, based his entire work around the Bible.

From the perspective of Goddard, your scripture quotes would be interpreted quite differently. That is, that those quotes do not warn people not to do "magick" in the sense of intentional change. Instead, they warn people not to be distracted by superstitious and conjuring type stuff - and approaches based upon in-world intermediaries or external objects - and in place of that focus upon the only true God, which in his interpretation is: ***the nature and power of your own imagination.***

In other words, you might be at risk here of unwittingly using quotes which instruct you to avoid superstition, to spread superstition - and using quotes which are intended to point you to a particular insight, to point people *away* from that insight! Those quotes are meant to encourage a person to focus on the actual nature of experience, which is achieved by engaging with it directly, rather than be fearful of it or be distracted from it.

> > Christians use rituals like crazy, then say, "be careful with magick", its really funny.

It's like a long-distance runner saying "be careful with that evil 'leg movement' stuff".

[...]

> I think they mean deception by satan. Heh.

Maybe someone should write a book, maybe called *A Course in Metaphors*...

Reply to “I went to a complete different reality for sometime”

Just as an aside, it's worth pushing back a little on the idea that there is some amazing method - *the* method - out there to uncover.

Much as it's tempting for newcomers to want to jump on a "fool-proof method", it is important to consider how any "method" relates to your actual experience, to the nature of it. Otherwise there's a risk of just engaging in yet more "sensory theatre" without really digging into the underlying situation - and going through the loop, once again, of finding something new, getting a sorta-result, then it not working, and then moving onto something else (because you never really knew what was working about it in the first place).

If ultimately what you're doing is lying down for a bit and imagining some crap for ten minutes, or saying some words for a while, it's worth pausing to consider how *precisely* that would make any difference to your experience. If that question isn't answered, if you don't dig deeper into it, then it's really just a superstitious activity, with no idea of the "causal" element of any change - and (interestingly, tellingly) you often find the reliability of a "method" fades out pretty quickly.

This is why the two **exercises** in the sidebar are really intended as illustrations of something, rather than methods as such. (Although of course the subreddit is built out from an original idea that there *might be* a "technique". *But then deconstructing that notion to gain insight.*)

> It isn't exactly explained why the exercises work either.

The exercises may *or may not* work: they aren't promises, they are experiments.

If they *do* work (or more broadly: if experiences arise subsequently which seem related to doing the exercise) then that's a starting point for contemplation. A starting point for considering what those outcomes imply about the nature of your experience (of "you" and "the world"), perhaps leading to an insight or at least a revision of your description of things, or even of your attitude towards descriptions in general. This may even include revisiting the whole idea of there being a "how things work" at all, in the usual sense.

Anyway: What the exercises *are*, though, is the stripped-down essence of an approach for investigating this. So just making up variations of them with extra stuff on top - saying this or that, imagining this or that - in the hope that some "secret sauce" will be discovered that gives "results", without having a clear reason for the additions, probably isn't very useful.

> Doesn't change happen because you want it to happen?

That's an interesting hypothesis. How could it be tested? What exactly *is* the nature of "wanting", and why would it be relevant or causal in terms of generating subsequent experiences? How does "wanting" relate to "me" and "the world"? And how, *precisely* does one go about "wanting" anyway?

So, perhaps the question isn't so much "why wouldn't it work?", but rather: "why do I think it would work, what is the basis for the choices and additions I am making, and how to I test those assumptions specifically?"

> With all the proof out there from this Reddit and Glitches Reddit combined there has to be something to this.

The idea behind the exercises is that one can *actually check for oneself* whether there is something to it, or not, rather than just reading stories about it. And then, because they focus on two particular facets of experience related to this, dig deeper into the nature of it by targeting different aspects of experience in turn. (There may also be a philosophical problem with "other people's stories", that isn't even just about believing them or not.)

> So, you are saying the exercises may work but not because of the exercises but something we don't quite understand yet?

Ultimately, I'd end up suggesting that what one might end up discovering is: it's more fundamental than any of those ideas you list would suggest. It is "before" them.

All of those ideas still have, as an assumption, that you are some sort of *person-object* located within a *world-place*. And ultimately, they are all essentially little "stories" about the *content* of experience, rather than the nature of *experience itself*. That is, the *context* of *all* experiences.

This is why we keep coming back to this notion that, when we come up with "explanations" for things, we must also bear in mind what a "description" actually is. Does it get "behind" our experiences? Or is it, instead, just another experience also (the experience of: "thinking about experiences"), at the same level.

Saying that something is magick or witchcraft or virtual reality or whatever, doesn't really add anything necessarily. Particularly when we are dealing with an experience of *world-facts* or the "formatting" of experience changing. Descriptions might be useful *ways of thinking about* such things, but they don't really - cannot really - encapsulate their nature or the cause of them.

If we go one step more "meta" in this way, it's like we take a step back from both our main strand of experience *and* the descriptions we make up about them. The problem we end up with, though, is that we're now dealing with something that is "before" concepts. How can you describe that which descriptions are "made from"? And so on. But maybe you don't *have* to describe something, or be able to communicate it, in order to *know* it. And perhaps demanding that something be conceptualised or restricting oneself to explanations - requiring that something "makes sense" or that it can be "understood" - is a barrier to a more direct realisation of the true situation.

In other words, I might end up suggesting that it's not that there *is* an explanation for how the exercises work (or any other methods in fact), in a fundamental way anyway, but that the attempt to construct one, or the willingness to put our experiences and assumptions under the microscope in this way, might lead somewhere useful regardless. Even thought it perhaps can't be articulated.

Extra bit: If making changes *is* simply about thinking (of? about?) what we want, then we must still consider what *exactly* we'd think - because there are many ways to think a thing of course - and also consider how that relates to the world (is the world itself a thought, if so in what way?) and what we are (if we are the thinker of thoughts, where and what are we and what are thoughts made from?), etc.

Reply to “How do I learn to do these things?”

What "energy"? I'd say forget about "energy" - especially if you can't define what you mean by it - and go directly for the outcomes you want, following the advice below.

So, to be specific: it's a feeling? And, for example, in social situation, you might want to generate an experience "as if" other people were experiencing that feeling about you, and acting accordingly? That makes sense.

We have to be careful because terms like "energy" and "vibration" and "frequency" get used in such hand-waving ways as if they were *things* or *causes* - perhaps because of their sort of feel-good use in law of attraction type descriptions - whereas here we want to be much more specific about their meaning. They key here, then, is that you'd want an experience "as if" such a thing occurred. This is different to saying that our experience *actually is* made from "energy" and that this is how the world is structured and how changes are caused, or whatever.

> > I read that energy is everything... I didn't do anything special but there energy is attracted to mine.

I'd suggest being a bit skeptical of all those sorts of descriptions. Or at least, view them *as* descriptions - that is, little parallel structures of thought - rather than "how things are".

"Energy is everything" is essentially a meaningless albeit feel-good idea, potentially, at least in terms of trying to actually do anything in terms of it. How exactly does "energy is everything" connect to our direct experience? It's so vague. And if it's merely a description of the *content* of a particular *type* of experience - a feeling, for example - then it's potentially a mistake to take that content as being how experiences "work". Now, if we said something like "everything we experience is ourselves, as awareness, taking on the shape of sensory moments", that would at least be something you could examine immediately, rather than only contemplate in disconnected abstract thought. Again, though, we'd be appropriately skeptical!

Anyway, I think you're onto a more useful approach with the formulation:

> > I want certain feelings and experiences.

That keeps things nice and clear. Essentially, you want experiences whose content is "as if" (that is: "consistent with the idea that") there is such a thing as energy and connection between people, *whether or not that is how things really are*. This avoids you ending up hypothesising about something happening "behind" your experiences, when in fact experiences may not actually *have* any "behind" or "outside" - or indeed any particular, fundamental, unchanging "how things work" at all.

Well, it's not necessarily clear that they *are* attracted to anything, in some behind the scenes way.

Your *actual experience* is of perceiving other people *apparently* being attracted to you, or of seeing other people *apparently* being attracted to one another. But the idea of "attraction" is something you are inferring: it belongs to your *description* rather than to the experience itself. You don't actually experience "attraction" in the sense of a causal mechanism; you have to be careful to not mix up that "buzzy feeling" that is part of an experience, with something that is "causing" that experience.

That you have this experience (of seeing this) isn't necessarily due to anything about the "people". There's no "attracting" going on behind the scenes, perhaps. Your experience of apparently seeing such things may be completely down to your own patterning, your own state as an experiencer!

The problem with the idea of "attraction" is maybe that it implies that there are independent objects, located within some sort of environment, and that there is some sort of "mechanism" - triggered by an act of some sort - which leads these objects to move towards each other in some way. These "objects" may of course be people, or some sort of event.

But the inherent divisions implied within this description is misleading, I think, because it leads us to try to conceive of some sort of action we might take in order to acquire certain properties which in turn would bring about an outcome. When in fact, if you attend to your actual experience as it is, it is not actually divided in this way.

And when you dig into that "attraction" type description, it reveals itself to be so hand-waving when it comes to the specifics, that there's not much of use going on. It's not really a *model* of experience at all - it's more of a *narrative*, a *language* that is used to talk about certain experiences using a certain turn of phrase.

So, personally, I'd move away from trying to imagine some sort of thing that happens "out there" that brings objects and situations from "over there" to "me" (one type of "attraction": the LOA style) *and also* away from the idea that there is a particular property you can acquire which makes you attractive (another type of "attraction": personal magnetism). Instead, I'd tend to think of this in terms of: how do I go about shaping my ongoing experience such that it contains moments "as if" I were summoning objects and situations and "as if" I was magnetic. That is, experiences that are *consistent with* those descriptions, those concepts, while avoiding falling into the assumption that those descriptions are how such experiences are *actually caused*.

Reply to “Problem with two glasses method.”

Yes, you really have to follow the last instruction ("carry on with your life"). It's okay to have passing thoughts; just let them pass. You don't need to do anything with them, they are just random spasms in imagination, let them be and return to whatever you are doing. *You don't need to deal with the thoughts.*

If you need something to do here, then I suggest that when you find you are narrowed down upon a thought and realise this, "release your hold" upon attention and become aware of the background space of the room. You should also do a daily releasing exercise, like the passive version of "overwriting yourself". Just 10 minutes every day, lying on the floor and giving up to gravity and "playing dead" - ceasing to hold onto your body, mind, and your attentional focus, and "being okay with whatever happens" - will work wonders.

Just as a general life thing, it is good to realise that thoughts are just passing sensory twitches from your current state; they don't need to be worked out or solved. If you have some persistent stuff, then the daily releasing will take care of it: typically, you'll find your attention drawn towards an area, a thought or sensation will increase in intensity, then it'll peak and dissolve into the background. During releasing, if you find you are "holding onto" your attention manually, you simply let go of controlling it again.

Another idea you might find useful: when you do something, physically or mentally, you *do not* need to narrow your attention to accomplish it - you don't need to "concentrate". Instead, allow your attentional focus to stay open and to shift however it deems appropriate, and simply *intend* the thing you want to do.

For instance: reading these words, sit back and relax, and instead of "using your eyes" or body or mind to do so, "just decide" to read the message and let it happen by itself. You don't need to "do" it, you can just sit back and let the experience *come to you*.

I mean, why not experiment a bit? Do some stuff for fun that doesn't really matter. Then come back to larger things after having let go of them for a while. And who knows...

The demo exercises, while also valid tools, are really designed to show you that "something is going on" without putting any effort - and then "big things have small beginnings". Although it's probably inevitable, and there's no limitation (in terms of plausible but apparently very unlikely things happening), it's not *ideal* that people tend to have their first ever experiment be something that *really, really matters*.

When you return to that, then it's fine to go directly, but you have to be able to let it go and let it come to you. However, if you want to do it in stages, if that's what you feel more comfortable with, that's okay. Again though, you have to let it come to you - trust that the change happens *literally at the point you complete the exercise*, and it's just a matter of you encountering the pre-created events that have been put in place as a result of it.

Remember: let the results come to you; after the exercise, there's nothing more for you to do. (Hmm. Accidental cheesy rhyming. Jumping by Dr Seuss!)

[...]

The *Just Decide* post is sort of a "call to arms" for this approach, although it usually doesn't make much sense on its own to people without a bit of expansion in context, as in the comment above.

Some background - So, the underlying (non-)observation is that you can't really experience yourself intending as such, and think that this comes about because: a) only a particular slice of your state is unpacked into the senses at any one time, b) most of your state isn't sensory anyway, although aspects of it are.

We tend to assume that what is sensory is what there is and all there is, but actually the whole state is here, now, "dissolved" into the background and accessible. Given that what we want to happen is shift our state from one configuration to another, and that state *is* us, then all that's required is to *declare* the new state, to "think unboundedly" of the outcome. Messing around by intending sensory aspects - e.g. trying to stand by summoning a state of muscle tension - is a waste of time. Such things generate an experience of effort; without them, there is no effort, simply the decision.

Which leads us to the origin of it, which is relatively mundane: The realisation that you can direct your body effortlessly, and not experience yourself "doing" or "directing" at all, although you "know" you are doing so. This is touched upon in many bodywork approaches, such as the Alexander Technique, but it never really gets pinned down, since they focus on the sensory aspect, still trying to have a "causal source" in the content of experience. And that's because it doesn't make sense without the perspective of seeing yourself as an "open aware perceptual space" in which and of which experiences arise, and which is "patterned" as your world.

Once you've done that, though, you can see the generality of the principle, and expand it to other things. Provided you aren't after an experience which involves world-rule-breaking, are happy for "still plausible if very unlikely circumstances" to be the route of your outcome, then "just decide" is all that's required. (Obviously, the more you work on adopting the perspective of an "open space", the more the definition of "plausible" is likely to soften.)

Summary - "Just Decide" comes from the idea that all intention is about a state change, that the entire state is always available right now, and that the aspect of the state you are changing is not necessarily in the senses. Since effort is a sensory experience, intention shouldn't be effortful unless you are intending tension. One can simply "just decide". Furthermore, from the perspective of being an "open aware perceptual space" in a particular state, there is no difference between pausing and intending an end-state of "my arm is raised in the air", and intending an end-state of "I am talking to my long-lost brother after 20 years".

Reply to “The 2 CUP method”

If you just specify that a particular outcome will occur - e.g. that a particular sensory scene will happen which implies the circumstances you desire - then, in the basic "patterning" model of experience, the path will just be whatever is the most efficient between the two moments of truth, given your current patterning (which you might think of as the "list of facts" that are currently in play). By moments of truth, I mean: *this* moment, which is being observed now and so is definitely true, and *that* moment, which you have just fully asserted and so is now substantially true. All moments in between were less well-defined, less fully asserted, and so prone to shifting to accommodate other assertions.

Note that "most efficient" doesn't mean that the path is calculated; it it is more like having two sticks connected by a loose elastic piece of string. If you plant the sticks at two specific locations on a landscape, the path of the piece of string will naturally fall and follow the contours of the landscape. And so... If you wanted to more completely control the path between *this* moment and *that* moment (now and your outcome moment; the two sticks), you might consider introducing additional sticks which define some of the moments between *now* and *then*. This needn't be done separately - it could also be done by including aspects which imply a particular path in your outcome definition. For example, if you want a nice car but you want to receive it because your husband or wife bought it for you as a gift, you could include that in the "getting the car" moment.

Generally, though, you have get comfortable with the fact that you can never "pre-know" everything that is going to happen - by which I mean, "unpack into the senses" in advance as a form of "pre-experiencing". Your life unfolding *is* that, really: the gradual unpacking of a pre-existing background patterned landscape. What "jumping" allows you to do, though, is assert the inclusion of certain points in that landscape, so that they are definitely incorporated.

If someone feels the urge to over-specify, it's worth asking themselves why. Just by recognising it's possible to specify something *at all*, you are already in a better position than you would otherwise be. If you want to "pre-experience" your life, then you're basically saying you only want to live life after you've already lived it. Which is essentially death.

> I think that "winning the lottery" goes against what I call "dimensional inertia"

Aside - On the "dimensional inertia" concept and your mind "accepting" some things, it's worth remembering that patterning - and therefore "jumping" - doesn't just apply to the the events you are going to encounter, it also applies to the facts of the world more generally, *and to your own sense of how things work*. In other words, it is possible to work upon what feels acceptable, to work on the "how things work" itself - you can get very meta with this.

[...]

The intermediary steps follow from the assertion of the target moment + the truth of the current moment. So, they exist as a deterministic sequence between shifts. They *become known* when you experience them, in "unfolded" form, as you pass from *this* moment to *that* moment* - although you are always experiencing them in "enfolded" form really.

What, *exactly*, does it mean, to "assume" something? I suggest: it is a form of experiencing it, "then" as now, or rather "defining" or "asserting" it. It all reduces to basically "intensifying *this* pattern rather than *that* pattern".

There's no good way to describe it, because in describing it we immediately imply the thing that is meant to be fading - but, yes, it's fully switching to one pattern and "forgetting" (or "forgiving" really) all else.

If you want to "see something" then you just *imagine-that* it is present and use *that* as the basis for things. There's no difference *in kind* of the experience you have with mushrooms and without. "Consuming mushrooms and having an experience" could be considered a *pattern* like any other. Once you can leverage, certainly, but you could work on establishing alternative, more direct, patterns if you felt so inclined.

Pure randomness is a concept, not a thing you ever perceive. The *world-as-it-is* doesn't have "pure randomness" in it; that is a parallel narrative. If what you are looking for is a causal connection between intention and experience, though, then repeated experimentation that pushes things to the limit is the way to demonstrate that. There's not much point in focusing on individual coincidences.

> > but i am always left bereft of anything substantial in my sight. i.e. i may realize a direct connection between experience and intention but the next day or the day after, that knowledge has gone and i have nothing to prove it ever existed.

"Prove" in what way? Of course, there is no place for "evidence" to be stored, but after observing a connection between the patterning of thought and the patterning of experience - and directly noticing they arise in the same space - then you're done. That's all you need. To prove it, you do it. There's no *record* that can be kept.

By a more direct pattern (versus mushrooms), I mean that mushrooms themselves are just an experiential pattern with no cause "behind" them. You could perhaps directly assert a pattern to accomplish the same thing, with some dedication.

The descriptive issue you're having is perhaps that, since the entirety of experience is "made from" you, you can never find the cause, because the cause is *the whole thing, shifting*. You will never find the cause *within* experience, because experience is *self-caused* - a shifting of shape. All you can do is note the intentions you make, and later recognise them appear as sensory moments.

You can't manifest anything into "reality", because that implies a separation. The whole thing is "reality". Reality == experience == awareness == you. Right? Everything you experience, then, is a *result*, a result of intention, and since intending is just a shifting of experience, you never actually experience intending *as such*. So you only ever experience results, you never experience a cause. Cause and effect exist only as concepts. All there actually is, is taking on the shape of results.

If there's no difference from 10 years ago and today, then you should set up a business selling beauty products! ;-)

Of course, in the sense that *you==awareness*, your "true face" is completely unchanged in 10 years, or indeed eternity. Why didn't I think of it his before! The perfect business opportunity! :-)

As to the "why" question: it occurs to me that since there is no specific "how things are" or "how things work", then there is no particular answer to that question.

[...]

Okay, let's go with this description:

The "world" is a single continuous pattern, and by being single and continuous, it must always be "coherent" - that is, it will always "make sense". Right now, the world is in a particular "state", which means a particular collection of patterns are dominant. You might imagine this as being a landscape, with the contours being the current state. Your ongoing experience is like your attention gradually scanning across that landscape - like a landscape of "moments" defined by the current patterns which are active.

Now, in addition to this we'll have the rule that:

- Experience is apparently local; intention is actively global.

Which means that although your attention may be on this particular moment of the landscape, if you intend something the intended pattern will apply to the entire landscape - it will shift to a new state, incorporating your pattern, and your experiences will be aligned with that new state from that point onwards, in a *pre-determined way*.

Returning to your point: If you wish for "enormous success" then that is a general pattern which is applied across the whole "world pattern"; the landscape is shifted *right then* such that subsequent moments will tend to have more of a "success" component. It becomes true *now* that you will have success *then*.

Later, if you wish to "win the jackpot", then *that* pattern is applied across the whole "world pattern"; the landscape (which has already been shaped by the "enormous success" intention) is now shifted to incorporate "win the jackpot" also.

What is happening is, your world (this state, or landscape, or "world pattern") corresponds to the accumulation of intentions and their implications. Between shifts, the world is deterministic - the events you encounter are defined until you perform another shift. Every time you intend an outcome or a trend, the world shifts to a new state which incorporates that pattern, and a new deterministic path. If you intend something that is *contrary* to a previous intention, then the world is shifted such that the original intention is diminished. Avoid doing that, and it will remain.

So there is no paradox. The path of experience is never pointing in two different directions at once, just as a mountain in a landscape doesn't have two different shapes at once.

Reply to “Two glasses - Tell me about your experiences...”

In the spirit of digging into things for increased clarity:

> >I actually did not intend it to make me change universes, merely re-pattern me to be better an manifestation\

What's the difference between "re-patterning" and "changing universes", though?

And: how do homeopathy and "vibrational medicine" work, and how is the two glasses exercise related to that? What is "energy/intention" stuff exactly, in that context?

There's a risk, here, of bouncing phrases around without connecting them properly to the actual experience, or perhaps reusing metaphors ("universes", "energy" and so on) that are sort of "too late" when it comes to accounting for these experience. That is, assuming that concepts which are foundational in the "standard" or even "new-age" descriptions, which are not in fact foundational to our actual ongoing experience, given fresh experiments and their results here. For example, most of those descriptions do in some sense still assume the model of being a *person-object* located within a *world-place* (where "the world" is a "stable simply-shared, spatially-extended 'place' unfolding in 'time'). I'd say that one of the first assumptions to fall under suspicion should be the "I am an object located in as space" one, and with that removed, you have to approach everything not in terms of *content*, but in terms of overall *context*.

[...]

Not therapy - although of course anything that clarifies might also be therapeutic as a side effect - and it's not about "believing" things.

Rather, a rational investigation into the "nature of experiencing", and also the nature of *descriptions about* experiencing (or just "descriptions" in general). But pursued from the ground up.

That is, all assumptions fall under the wary eye, be they "standard perspective" ones *or* "mystical" ones. Direct experience, then build out (but noting the *context* if experience not just face value *content*).

The notion that we are a *person-object* located within a *world-place*, for example, might fall under investigation sooner rather than later given some results, but it is not then replaced with another description of the same type: swapping "people and places" with "consciousness and energies", and taking them literally, is perhaps to repeat the same mistake - and so on.

The subreddit itself deliberately takes no official view. First, because it's all about personal investigation. Second, because that turns out to be a somewhat nonsensical phrase (an official view wouldn't have much to say, in a way). Instead, it adopts a "meta" perspective where nothing is taken to be fundamental - except, implicitly, the basic fact of experiencing (*that there is* experience).

[...]

> > But how do you know it's a mistake?

It's a mistake in a different sense than you probably mean here:

> I appreciate it might be your philosophy, but how do you know your philosophy is correct?

It is not "correct". No description is. Descriptions are merely *useful*. As a framework within which to discuss experiences, or they point the way to an insight or experience. Or they don't. Beware the "reification of abstraction" and all that. Descriptions aren't *true*.

That is, beware taking concepts as external things, specifically assuming that descriptions or philosophies "get behind" experience, rather then themselves being experiences (the experience of: "thinking about experiences"). Implicitly, that would be equivalent to saying that the description "causes" the experience. For example, that "gravity" causes things to fall down, rather than being, loosely speaking, the name of a description of - a codification of observations of - "things falling down".

Now, even though it might be suggested (subject to experimentation) that adopting a description in a certain way may lead to experiences "as if" the description were true - something we might call "patterning" - those descriptions themselves never actually "explain" experiences. The description *still* wouldn't be "what is really happening".

I think the little exercise makes the distinction clear, as a starting point anyway. One thing that is important here is that we don't just get lost in little "castles in the sky" that lack many "observational touch-points" - that is, self-consistent thought structures which are coherent but don't actually connect to direct experience, except very minimally. We need to distinguish somewhat between *models* and things which are vague and therefore operate more like a *narrative* or *language*. (I'd suggest that, as generally used, concepts like "energies" falls into the latter category.)

It's a mistake in the sense of taking a conceptual framework as being literally, independently, causally true - taking a description as being "what is really happening". (Unless I've lost the thread here. I interpreted your question as asking me why adopting "consciousness and energy" as a description would be the same mistake as adopting "objects and places". The mistake is to take *either* as being fundamentally actual or true.)

I agree that having a memory (or *any* conception really) of something can make it easier to establish or re-establish that pattern as prominent in subsequent experience. It's necessary, even - or at least, if it is no directly conceived of, it must be implicit in what *is* conceived of.

However, the problem with "a group of people doing this together" is that there aren't any people, and that you aren't a person either - in the sense of being a *person-object* having an experience. There is a *person-formatted experience* happening, but that is to say a different thing. Since there are no independent people in the sense of *beings*, and they have no separate power or intention of their own, then talking of a "group of people" doing anything - doing *anything* - is ultimately meaningless. Except in one sense:

It *would* be possible to have an experience *"as if"* you, as a person, get together with other people and do some sort of ritual and then experience an outcome that is much more intense than that which accompanied your experience *"as if"* you were a single person doing this alone.

Still, though, the entire experience of this group activity would in fact still be "awareness" just "taking on the shape of" the experience of apparently being a person in a world, with other people, doing this ritual and getting results. In actuality, the *entire experience* would be a "result", and all the doings and activities merely a sort of "sensory theatre".

Aside - The lesson from that exercise is that there is not "**an** awareness" or "**the** awareness" or "awareness**es**". There is just "awareness" - unbounded and without inherent structure, which "takes on the shape of" situations and, therefore, moments of experience. (It is "before" division and multiplicity; those are also patterns *taken on by* awareness; this is why it is not solipsism.) You can notice right now, directly, that this entire moment is "made from you" and that there is no outside to it, or an inside for that matter. Furthermore, you can't find *you-the-person* anywhere within experience, and any thought you have *about* the experience or *being-a-person* are *themselves* simply further experiences, within-and-as "awareness". The ultimate point being, yes *you-as-awareness* might taken on the shape of *being-a-person-in-a-world-with-other-people-and-doing-stuff-together*, but it is a sort of "patterned image", with the all the content of the image being a "result" from the perspective of the context of it. This context is the only "cause", and even then it is more like a "self-shaping" than a cause-and-effect type cause.

> But isn't that just your conceptual framework?

Not really. *First there is a direct noticing of what the fundamental fact of experiencing is* - and that is primary. Everything else is just an attempt to convey the implications of that. Which is why I take pains to say that conceptual frameworks are *themselves* just further experiences. Basically, you *cannot think about this*. It is literally unthinkable, because we are talking about "that which thinking is 'made from'" - or indeed, that which *structures or patterns* are "made from". You can't use conceptual structures to talk about pre-structure. However, conceptual structures can still be *useful*. It is inherently the case that there are not *experiencer**s*** (note the plural and the implication that there are objects *having* experiences). However, there *are* indeed *experienc**es***. There are just not simultaneous, or sequential, or parallel *experiencers* or *experiencees*. Hence ending up phrasing it as "experienc**ing**", and so on.

Now, what difference does that make to the *person-formatted* experience? Mainly, it means that the patterning of that experience is not fundamental, that there is no world "out there" as such, but most importantly it means that nothing in the *content* of your experience is the *cause* of it. And since you are trying to *cause change*, that may be relevant.

> And what does a "persona formatted experience" really mean different to being a person? Wouldn't it be mostly the same thing?

In content terms, mostly yes. But it means that the concept of a "person", a *thing* located within a "world", is not an accurate representation of your actual situation, and so that ideas built upon that will also be inaccurate. You may make all sorts of "discoveries" as you have the experience adventuring about in the world, including "transformative" experiences with "other people", but you'll never be uncovering anything deep - just more experiences. Note that I am not disparaging that! That is what it's all about! However, since this subreddit isn't just a "self help" forum for generating happy experiences, and we tend to spend time unpacking descriptions and concepts to see how the relate to the nature of *all* experiences, I'm obviously going to spend some time unraveling our perspectives like this.

> The whole last paragraph, you say what I can find, but honestly I have not found any of that, maybe I could, but none of it speaks to me as a self evident truth.

Well, you have to examine your experience, now, directly. Rather than either just think about it, or pay attention to the content of it. It's not an easy thing to convey, and I'm not really trying to *persuade* you of it -

I'm just suggesting that this is something you can do and notice, and that the *direct fact of your experience* somewhat re-contextualises the content of it. Anyway, just put that on the back burner for now perhaps.

> I am at a loss as to how any of this is proven, why it is necessary, or really why it is useful

It depends on what you're after, of course. The ultimate aim of it would be to cease to be delusional about one's circumstances. (That is not meant in a negative way!)

> So while I find your ideas interesting, nothing really beats results, and there is one thing I know from fringe physics research, theories be damned when the experiments disagree!

Quite so. As mentioned regularly, success of a "jump" is to be judged by having the outcome you intended subsequently arise within your experience - nothing else counts. However, that is the start and not the end, because typically (after some experimenting) the results seem to rather break the "standard world" model. And not just in a simple way that can be adjusted for easily - it breaks the model of there being a "you" and a "world" at all. And no fringe physics can save it. Anyway, you'll notice that the subreddit itself doesn't really offer conclusions, it just sets up a couple of exercises to act as the starting point for personal investigation. The two exercises are designed to potentially offer (eventually, when considered and pushed) two insights into our experience (albeit ultimately two aspects of the same insight).

Let me emphasise though: *This discussion isn't meant to dissuade you from trying out "group experiments" or anything else. We're just spending some fun time unpacking the assumptions implied within that idea.*

> when I first arrived one guy who followed you for about a year gave up, and I have seen a few others who are frustrated.

Nobody's meant to be "following" anyone! Primarily, because this ends up being about unpacking your own experience, and noticing that the idea of independent "methods" and "techniques", or even a specific "how things work" or "mechanism", doesn't quite stack up. But that is to jump ahead: this is a forum for experimentation and discussion, the only extra bit is this tendency to be doubtful about descriptions *vs* experience - that "meta" perspective thing.

> your philosophy is a total rewrite to reality and not just a fundamental plot twist

Everything stays exactly the same, except for a shift in context.

> it says more about what it isn't than what it is

That in the nature of it. It's like: There's a piece of paper. The paper can be folded in any shape. Now, what shape would you fold the paper into, to represent *the piece of paper itself*? Actually, the only way to point to the paper itself is to indicate how all the different folds one can make from the paper, are *not* the paper (while simultaneously they are *all* the paper, confusingly). Similar metaphors include: trying to make a sandcastle which communicates the fact of both "the beach" and "sand". It it wasn't like this, then everyone could just read a book or follow a step-by-step method and become "enlightened" (or whatever you want to call it).

> it removes useful tool to talk about things and useful concepts.

No, it simply recognises those tools and concepts for what they actually are.

> Side question: In your view, if someone wanted to, could they rewrite reality to the point of arbitrarily redefining the structure of the atom? Not just bending but rewriting physics to however they willed?

Well, physics is easy to rewrite: it's just a collection of descriptions, based on a subset of experiences which were abstracted into "observations". The world is not made from atoms - although "the world" (a particular idea) is made from "atoms" (a particular conceptual framework). Just have a few fresh observations, then make up some new descriptions! ;-)

You need to be more specific when you use the word "reality". It's probably laden with assumptions. Do you mean "the direct fact of this moment of experience and its content", or do you mean something like "this particular conceptual framework". *Reality*, I'd suggest, is this moment right now. Anything beyond that, is storytelling.

. . . Anyway, it might be beneficial to separate out into strands: this sort of conversation *and separately* your own experiments and results. (Perhaps better to call them "outcomes", actually, since it's a less loaded term.) Because this stuff we're talking about can be a distraction, perhaps, if gone into too early.

Just bear in mind, though, that "getting results" doesn't necessarily confirm a "this is how things really work fundamentally". That is, the *nature of the experience of the results*. Always follow any apparent causal chain right down the line, right up to: "referring to my *direct experience*, how did I cause the raising of my hand in order to wave the magickal wand in this ritual". And keep in mind this notion of the context of all experiences.

After playing with that for a bit, this and the other conversations may not be so jarring, because there will be a better sense of where they are coming from (note: that doesn't mean you'll necessarily *agree* with them of course!).

[...]

Note that *actually doing* it is different to *thinking about* it, though, and in fact that is part of the point.

Reply to “[experiment] what if we all jumped at the same time?”

I suggest it wouldn't make a difference *actually*, as compared with a dedicated single-person performance, since it's a "single-user model", but you might generate an experience "as if" a group of people effected a greater change due to a combined act (and retained memories of doing so).

After all, *any* technique we use to accomplish something is in fact a bit of an act - it has no causal power itself, other than the intention that goes along with it (it's "assigned meaning"), plus any habitual meanings that might have become associated with it. Using the glasses, and talking to other people about using the glasses at the same time, would both be examples of theatre, of creating "handles" for pattern triggering, a sensory experience associated with an intention.

> Can you explain more about 'handles' and 'theatre' please?

The "theatre" aspect is that actions are actually experiences (the sensory experience of performing an action), and no experience ever causes another experience *as such*. It is the intention triggering the associated meaning (the extended pattern) that results in (actually *is*) the shift in state. However, simply intending is like shape-shifting; it's much easier to explicitly or implicitly assign meaning to an experience, and then intend that experience (doing the glasses *means-that* this is happening).

The idea of "handles", then, is that you have associated a pattern with a particular sensory element, made that element an *aspect* of a pattern, so that when you perform an operation on the element, you are logically performing the same transformation on the pattern. Hence "handles" - the labeled glasses are *literally* the sensory aspects of those two patterns (situations), and the water level is *literally* the intensity of contribution of those patterns (situations). So pouring the water from one glass to the other *literally* changes the relative intensities and shifts your state *at that exact moment*.

(This is why you should accept that it is done and "carry on with your life". The deterministic pattern has been set; the evidence of your new state will arise in sensory experience as you encounter it - the results "come to you". Any future tinkering to try to make things happen, is in fact a further tweaking of your state, although generally to less effect than the exercise.)

There's no difference between a mental and a physical act - because they're both just sensory experience in your mind (your open aware space). However, many people find it easier to use stable forms that are apparently independent - and it has the benefit of allowing the "how it works" to go under the radar of self-doubt, over-thinking and criticism.

Reply to “[META] I'd like to suggest that not all jumps are preferable, and that to the extent you believe in this phenomenon you should be respectful of its power and prayerful in its application.”

> [Q: This. It says right there in the Tesseract Working that this is akin to suicide. The fly by night way some approach the idea of Jumping betrayed their immaturity towards responsible magick
>
> It shifts your world including your experience of "you", so it's good to be cautious. It's an effective suicide in that the "you" that you are experiencing will shift more discontinuously than is usual. Having said that, most people are unwittingly do a version of this quite frequently - but they are just oblivious to it because their world is remaining self-consistent.]

The problem with the mirror method and the tesseract approach is that they present a ritual which is by default "undirected". Since most people don't understand what "intention" is (even if they imagine something, they'll often not *will* it to give it context) even directing it is a little haphazard. That's why I think Neville Goddard style approaches or pattern-triggering are problem better, because you are more conscious of an "act" taking place, and you already have a direction in mind.

A problem with all magickal dabbling is that people tend to not believe it, or believe that belief is necessary, and so mess around - and then get actual results whether they realise the connection or not. Fortunately, basic mirror-staring is unlikely to cause problems; it's most likely simply to accelerate the path you are already hurtling along.

Reply to “[Theory] The Mirror Method Is Just Another Metaphor for the Dimension Jumping Metaphor; A More Direct Approach to Shifting Reality”

It's all "active metaphors", as it's phrased in the sidebar. They are all different ways of *indirect creation and amendment* in what amounts to an imagined world. Remember that even with the mirror method, you are dealing with something that is within you; the so-called "mirror" is inside your experience. Real mirrors are actually just very stable *ideas of* mirrors. So in the mirror method you are *declaring* that "mirrors" have the property of allowing jumps - and so they do. Equally, you could declare that visualising a desire in detail "inserts it into the universe" and so it will come to pass. And so it does. Or perhaps there is a bad situation, and you bring forth a thought about it. Implicitly in doing so, you are recognising that this thought *is* the situation. By updating the "bad feeling" into a "good feeling" you are *literally changing that situation*. (This is the Ho'oponono approach.)

In all cases, the implicit truth is that everything in experience is basically *objects made from imagination*. To *imagine-that* you are doing something is to actually be doing that something - subject to the other things you have *imagined* to date. You can have a lot of fun experimenting with this. Random example: take two glasses, one filled with water, one empty. *Declare* that the empty glass *is* you and that the other glass *is* the world. The water *is* an experience you desire. Now, pour the water from the world-glass into the you-glass *knowing* that you are pouring your desire from the world into your personal experience.

To "reprint" something from before: *"However you imagine that it works, That's how it works."* -- The rule of metaphor

[...]

Yeah, the word "visualization" is a bit of a problem I guess, because it implies an actual visual. Maybe the word "shadow-sensory imagery" is better. Anyway, the main point is that doesn't have to be visual, just summoning a sensory aspect of any sort is sufficient. Even just the *feeling-idea* of something. What it's important is that the experience you summon is viewed *as actually being* the thing your are trying to access and change.

So if I think of my (say) friend in trouble. That thought *is* that situation, and having accessed that thought I may allow it deepen and become clearer, and then adjust it accordingly.

The "full responsibility" part is really just a recognition that you are experiencing your own "private view" and that everything in your apparent world *is you*. Things are not your *fault* but they are literally aspects of you. So if you want them to change you must do so yourself, either indirectly via second cause ("causing" an email to your sister which apologies for the trouble you caused at the wedding) or directly via first cause (accessing the "sister relationship" directly in your mind and modifying it). Both are actually first cause, of course, because that's all there is.

> [On the complexity and detail of the mirror method]. Is it not a bit too complicated for what you might do with two glasses and some water?

You *might* do it with two glasses of water, but how many everyday people are going to take it seriously and *actually declare* that the glasses and water *literally are* that situation?

The pomp and ceremony of the mirror method ritual and its opacity to logic are beneficial for getting people to anticipate that something valid is going on. Mirrors do have that "other dimension" vibe and setting things up to be a bit scary and detached from normal experience really helps commitment - the *implicit declaration* that this ritual corresponds to dramatic change.

The other methods listed (subjective imagination, tesseract magick, re-patterning) are more direct but people do like to feel they are performing an action before they will *commit* to change.

The main problem is that we can't actually experience willing or intending, we can only experience the result. So folk tend to want to "do" something that they can call "the act", even though that is a result too.

> >Of course, fault is a loaded word, and I don't recall using the word.

No, you didn't use the word "fault". It was me using it preemptively (for those who might read) because it's often the first thing people think of when it comes to the notion of being responsible for the world - rather than getting the "it's all you" interpretation.

Reply to “[THEORY] Why I think we REALLY aren't getting results”

What, *exactly*, is the "will of nature" though?

Isn't it, ultimately, a fictional construct being used as a black box explainer for describing "why I didn't get my outcome according to my assumptions"? Isn't it essentially a replacement for the "will of God" concept. There, too, we'd end up by asking the question: what is "God"? Here, we might ask: what is "Nature" and how does it relate to "me"?

The risk, here, I guess, is that we end up proposing entities which do not exist fundamentally. We may have experiences *consistent with* the concepts, in a broad sense, but forget that the description itself is not existent or causal apart from that.

Similarly, what is "human intent"?

If the human experience is itself really just a particular structuring of "awareness" (or "experiencing"), then it makes no sense to talk of "human intent" - because "human" is a certain formatting of experience and a certain description of that experience. "Human" is not a *being* - and *that which experiences and intends* is itself not human. It loops back to questioning the more fundamental assumption of being a *person-object* located within a *world-place*, which the "will of nature" concept implies again. Now, taking a step back, it is certainly true that our ongoing experience is *structured*. It's not just a random whirlwind of disconnected multi-sensory image fragments. What is the *nature* of that structure though, and to what extent is it fundamental? If one supposes that there is a *thing* called "Nature" and that it has a will independent of *you-as-awareness*, then one must consider what the *nature* of that "Nature" is. What it is "made from" and how it interacts. More importantly, what is the evidence of it in *direct experience*? We risk swapping one (alleged) superstition with another, except labelling one description as "really what is happening" compared with the other (even though neither is more fundamental). The very idea that there is a "what is happening" behind the scenes at all, as it were, is potentially open to question. In which context I would add:

> > But the claim is made that we are outrageously free and in principle can have anything that we desire, that only our beliefs or the action of our subjective minds holds us back, that all possibilities are out there, and all you have to do is call them to you.

This seems more like a summary of the "law of attraction" concept and not what is being explored here, surely. That's the sort of thing that is being *investigated*, not *claimed*.

> > All the important questions are functional ones, having a bearing on shaping results.

The problem with sticking with functional questions, is that the very nature of "doing" is also under investigation. So, in essence I'd still say that you are simply describing the fact that one's ongoing experience is structured, is "patterned". I would not disagree with that. That is certainly true in direct experience.

However, introducing the concept of the "Will of Nature" doesn't add anything further to that observation, I think. If the properties of the "Will of Nature" are simply identical to the observation that "experience is patterned", and that simply "wanting" something doesn't instantly modify those patterns, we aren't gaining anything in terms of insight. Except, because of the implications of the term "Will", the notion that there is an

independent "power" or "purpose" which shapes our experience. This is something more than saying it is patterned. What is the functional, the practical use of that description?

Note: I definitely agree that descriptions *in and of themselves* are not necessarily valuable. But it is not clear that the concept of the "Will of Nature" goes beyond that either.

> I no longer think those are actually much useful as questions.

They are useful because they unpack the relationship between descriptions and the *nature of* (as distinct from the *content of*) our ongoing direct experience. More importantly, they force us to examine the relationship between ourselves and our experiences - if indeed there can be said to *be* a relationship, even. You are still left with a particular structured description, implying the actual existence of something called the "Will of Nature". Now, it may not be your intention, but implied within you description is the concept of "you" being in some way embedded within some sort of a structure, a structure which is independent of you and imposes itself upon you. Is that what is actually experienced?

> In my opinion, the will of nature exists fundamentally... what I am calling the actions of nature.

In what sense, though does nature "act"? By saying the "Will of Nature" is fundamental, are you simply trying to convey the idea that some of our experiential patterning cannot be modified?

> Therefore patterns act upon us which are not malleable simply by a change of notion in regular states of consciousness.

But - is this not just a restatement of the idea that you can't change the more abstract or factual patterning simply by "wanting" or "wishing" (whatever those are, exactly)?

We'd then ask: What is a "state of consciousness" in this regard and why would it make a difference? What is a "deep technique" or "remote state": deep relative to what, remote relative to what? How do these relate to the "Will of Nature"? Is it a battle of wills, a power wrestle between entities? Without asking those questions, then our concepts aren't functional, because they don't suggest anything to "do".

> If you contest this, show me someone able to conduct a conversation without a heartbeat.

How does this connect to the idea of the "Will of Nature", though? That still suggests it is a black box explainer for "anything you cannot immediately do".

> I think there is a false binary that we are free to change things or we are not. I think at a very deep level we may be free to do so, but I don’t think that level is trivially accessible.

So, I didn't see a false binary there, because that wasn't being asserted (that we are free to change things or we are not). What you are saying - a useful insight though it might be - still seems to be little more than "we observe that experience is patterned and we also observe that we can't simply update the broader patterning by just wanting-wishing". I think the introduction of the "Will of Nature" and the other stuff simply clouds this. Why go beyond simply saying that there is a "patterning" to experience, and that some patterns seem more easily modifiable than others?

The questions would then be:

- What is the nature of "patterns" and "patterning" (what does that concept point to)?

- What is the relationship between "patterns" and "the world" and "you", and:
- Why are some patterns seemingly more easily modified than others?

Ultimately, then, probably my main issue with your concept is that it doesn't *actually explain* why someone "really" doesn't get a (particular) result or finds they apparently can't change their experience instantly; it simply restates it in different language whilst potentially introducing something that implies additional entities and relationships that can't be tested (or more: aren't required or useful).

[...]

So, I'm struggling a little here. After all that, I *still* don't think you've added anything to the basic statement: "experience is apparently patterned and some patterns seem remarkably persistent". Except, perhaps, with the addition of the idea of a "cosmic agency" or "will of nature" that you must in some way be "aligned" with in order to make significant changes. But then, that itself would just seem to be a synonym for the patterning of oneself as "that which takes on the shape of states of experiences". (When I say "oneself", I of course don't mean *human* self, since "human" here would just mean a certain patterning of experience: "human" isn't *a being*, it is *formatting* of *being*, in such a description.)

Perhaps we are talking at cross purposes here, though. And so:

To try to get us on the same footing - because it *may* well be we are sort of talking about the same overall concepts, and I actually feel we almost are in one particular way, if I could get you to articulate it more *concisely* - in your description, or indeed in your experience:

- What is "the world"? What are "you"? What is the relationship between the two? And:
- What is the relationship between the "will of nature" or "cosmic agency" and that? What is the relationship between *your direct experience right now* and that?

Without this, to me, it feels as though there's a nice phrase, something somewhat attractively romantic even - the "will of nature" - without anything actually behind it, that we can connect usefully to direct experience.

I agree about the self-consistency point, as regards descriptions. However, I really meant it more in the sense that some of your prior responses, particularly the more general responses, suggested to me that I hadn't gotten across what I had intended to.

For when I pick up on this, could you clarify what *you* mean when you use the term "empirical you"?

[...]

So, let's pick this up again. At the outset, though, I'd suggest that your original post perhaps slightly misunderstands the nature of the subreddit and what is meant by "dimensional jumping" in this context. But that doesn't necessarily matter for digging into what we are discussing right now - we can come round to that later, since it'll follow (ahem) naturally.

In short, it is conceived of as an investigation rather than a method or literal description - which is why the demo "exercises" are labelled as such, rather than as "techniques". This is also why discussion like this are prevalent, rather than just "what is the best way" - because ultimately the very idea of there being "a way" or a "how things work" doesn't entirely hold up to scrutiny. And in fact, the very notion of a "description", and its

relationship to one's experiences, falls under scrutiny too of course! (The link I included in one of the earlier responses was intended to clarify this: this isn't meant to be a "law of attraction" type of a deal.)

Anyway, on we go:

> So I have a sense of myself as a limited being grounded in a world.

Can you describe that sense of yourself as a limited *being* more clearly? What leads you to draw the conclusion that you are a being (which I'm interpreting from your language as describing a sort aware observer or *person-object* located within a world that is like a *place-environment*)?

> That being has boundaries to its nature and its actions which I can't dispel just by wishing them dispelled. I can't point to the Empire State Building and have it take off like a rocket, for example.

What do we mean by "wishing" in this context? I'm not sure that there's necessarily an expectation that "wishing" can bring about changes. Do we mean something like "wanting" or "willing"? And again we'll have to be clearer about what we mean by this. When one "wishes", what are we actually doing? (And there's the problem, too, that people tend to mean different things by words like "willing" and "intending" and so on. We'd benefit from clarifying this by articulating the actual experience of these.)

This might seem to return us to the idea of "functional" - this 'wishing" doesn't always work so what does? - but we'd have to be careful because it's not clear that *any* action is a cause of an experience. The experience of "wishing" - and indeed anything else that seems like an act or "altered state" experience, that you sense "me doing this" - might be just another *result*, another experience. While an act may or may not be followed by a desired outcome, it's not clear that the outcome and the act are causally related, other than within whatever description we have adopted. And: what causes the act, since the act is itself another outcome?

> If I declare myself to be entirely free, and yet I still find myself NOT to be entirely free, then something acts upon me.

Not necessarily. That presumes that "declaring" (or what you mean by "declaring") has any causal attributes, rather than itself simply being a result, an experiential outcome, of... something.

> Therefore there is something other than "me" and which might as well be called the World, or the will of nature.

My problem with this, is that when I go looking for a "me" in my actual experience, I don't really find one. For sure, there are various sensations and suchlike, and the occasional thought, and the sensations and thoughts that appear most regularly I might refer to as "me".

However, the only thing that actually persists is the fact of "experiencing" or "awareness", and not any of those sensations or thoughts. This "me" of experience seems to have no particular location, it's more like a sort of unbounded void-presence which "takes on the shape of" my experience - including the experience of a perspective, with some sensations apparently "over here" and the room apparently "over there", but all of it *me-as-awareness*. And so, in fact, "me" and "my" is essentially meaningless now, in this context.

And I don't find a "world" either, in the sense that it is normally conceived of, for the exact same reason. There is a "world" in the sense of a certain description or conceptual framework consisting of varies ideas

about this main strand of experience, but it is *itself* an experience - the experience of "thinking about experience". And it is at the same level; it does not get "behind" my main strand of experience and explain it in some deeper sense.

In fact, it turns out there is no place for any "me" or "world" to be, as described in the usual standard description, because there is no "outside" to this experiencing.

Hence, to talk of an "empirical me" other than as a conceptualisation, and a "will of nature" acting upon it, whilst perhaps useful for conceiving of, say, intentional change, is not good for pointing at the *nature* of that change of of experience. Unless carefully understood as such (a useful pattern which might be *overlaid* but is not *fundamental*), it involves introducing fictional entities that not in fact experienced - although one might have experiences "as if" they are true. (This final point, in fact, is the real problem: adopting a certain description and intending in terms of it, tends to bring about experiences consistent with it.)

So, in case that got a little meandering, I'll bring out the key points as being:

- Direct experience does not support the idea of a "me" located within a "world" or a "will of nature" imposing upon it.
- The idea that "wishing" or "declaring" should bring about change - and that it not doing so is indicative of some external agent and/or a division in experience - is problematic unless we are clear about what "wishing" actually is, in the context of direct experience.
- Introducing the concept of "will of nature" tends to obscure the nature of experience and change rather than clarify it - unless it is simply a romantic rephrasing of the observation "some patterns seem more persistent" and is recognised as such.

Aside - You brought up "altered states of consciousness" in a previous comment too, but I've set that aside for now because I think it fall into much the same format as the above, and unravelling will tend to give insight as to the other. While we might talk of "functional" approaches, if it turns out that there is no "me" or "world" in the sense of independent objects, then the idea of an "operation" that one can perform upon the world is already "too late", at least if we are viewing it in terms of so-called tools or techniques. The meaning of "functional" will not be the same after such a shift in context. Similarly, the idea that the phrase "you create the world" is meant in a *personal deliberate* way also changes - removing the requirement that there be some independent external being or entity deliberately creating things because "hey, I didn't do it". The situation is more like an *eternal landscape* that is "made from" *being* and which occasionally shape-shifts into different state-topologies (all metaphorically speaking), rather than a *spatiotemporal environment* where objects are explicitly invented by *beings*.

[...]

So, I'd take the general idea of Pantheism but push it a little further than is normally the case. There, one tends to conceive of it suggesting a world which is still 3-dimensional and extended, containing objects, and those objects are "parts of", what you might call "God", and they are having experiences. (I know this is a matter of debate often, but I still find it to be the default impression: a half-step been panpsychism and non-duality.)

I'd take this a step further and say that it is *experiences* that are "made from" God (or whatever). Not objects and spaces. Again, too, this isn't quite the same way of thinking.

And then: "God" is you *and* you are "God", but only in a very particular meaning of "God". We are *not* talking about an *entity God* here, not *a* being. Rather, simply "being". The *experience* of *apparently* being a person is "made from" God, but there is no "you" that is an object, a being, that is God, nor is God a sort of being which has taken on the shape of an object. Rather, "God" is what experiences are "made from".

And so, we end up saying best-effort things like (excuse pasting from a previous comment for efficiency) describing "God" as a sort of "non-material material":

[We might say that the] only fundamental, permanent truth is the fact of *being-aware* - or "awareness" - with everything else temporary patterning on an "as if" basis. Rather than a person with a subconscious who is sending out requests into the world, you are more like a "**non-material material** whose only inherent property is *being-aware* or 'awareness', and which 'takes on the shape of' states of experience, states imply and define all subsequent sensory moments". Right now, for example, you have "taken on the shape of" apparently (on an "as if" basis) *being-a-person-in-a-world*.

Meanwhile, this means that any so-called "magick" is, despite any theatrics that go along with it, a *self-shaping* of oneself into a new experiential state. All apparent entities or techniques or other causes that are experienced are just aspects of that state: moments as "results".

In this case, we don't have multiple "beings" having different experiences, and nor do we have a single being having multiple experiences (the idea of a "single being" is nonsensical here anyway). The only thing that is ever "happening" is *this experience right now*, and we can't really talk of simultaneous experiences *or* sequential experiences from different perspectives, because an experience does not occur *in time* (time is a patterned aspect *of* an experience).

Interestingly, we end up here trying to construct descriptions which avoid saying things that are incorrect, rather than trying to capture the truth of the matter as such (because "non-spatial" and "non-temporal" things can't actually be conceptualised).

Reply to “[THEORY] The Nature of Consciousness”

> Firstly, how do we go about defining what exactly consciousness is?

I think it's perhaps useful to distinguish between "consciousness" (simply the property of *awareness* or *being*), "consciousness-of" (awareness, the *context*, taking on the shape of an experience, of *content*), and "self-consciousness" (the identification with a part of that content as "me"). In discussions, these often get muddled up, with people arguing about identification with a "me" as ("being conscious"), when really the core of it all is the *fact of the property "awareness"* (being-awareness).

In that sense, then "awareness" isn't anything. That is, it is not an *object*, rather it is the *subject* to all experiential states. You can't define it as such, because it is "before" definitions - since definitions are based on the division of experience and the relation of one part to another. However, for convenience, we can talk of this property of awareness, so long as we recognise that the concept cannot capture it - since awareness cannot be thought about (it is that which thoughts are "made from") - and that there is no fundamental *experience* that corresponds to it (all experiences are it). In other words, there is no use looking for awareness within the content of experience, because it is "that which takes on the shape of experiences", including *thoughts about* experiences (which are themselves experiences: the experience of thinking about things).

> Consciousness is, in simplest terms, the ability to recognize that you are a living being having an experience. The experience itself does not matter.

So this is almost it, except that "recognition" is an experience, and so it would fall into the category of content, of "consciousness-of" and maybe even "self-consciousness". But to some extent this is just an issue with words. To avoid the implication that there's an action, relation or a separation involved, we might rephrase as consciousness *is* the property of awareness or "knowingness" or "I am" or "experien*cing*" (as opposed to *an* experience).

> This begs the question, though; where does your consciousness come from?

It doesn't come from anywhere, it is eternal (as in "before" or "outside" of time, rather than "forever"). It is not an object, and so it has no beginning nor end, nor any boundaries of any sort, nor any location (it is also "before" division and multiplicity). Basically, what it is, is "*is*ness" - it is the fact or property of existence, without any existence itself as such.

> If it arose only from the matter in this reality, how would it be possible to shift into a different frame of reference...

What we have to be careful of here, is the tendency to think about things in a 3rd-person "view from nowhere" that is never actually experienced. When we say "arose from matter in this reality", we are again imagining that consciousness is an "object" which can emerge or be created from something (has a beginning and end, and has boundaries and a location). As we've seen, though, this isn't the case. And what's more, that imagining (of consciousness being an object), *is itself occurring within and as consciousness or awareness*.

I feel it's really important to keep coming back to your actual 1st-person experience, because that keeps you straight when you find yourself trying to *think about* consciousness. It's important to remind yourself that you are thinking in metaphors, and whereas with other areas a metaphor would exist as a "parallel

construction in thought" at the same level as the thing you were describing, pointing to something alongside it, in this specific case the metaphor cannot do this, it points *nowhere and everywhere* - because we are talking about that which is the *nature of the experience of* metaphors themselves.

The library is a nice metaphor for the "infinite gloop" of all possible patterns, eternally available in the background to be accessed, a subset of which are formatted into sensory experiences. If you haven't already, you should read *The Library of Babel* by Jorge Luis Borges. Several of his short essays and stories are metaphors for reality, experience and identity.

Other metaphors:

- ***The Blanket:*** What you truly are is the "non-material material" whose only inherent property is *awareness* or *being-aware*, and which "takes on the shape of" experiences. Right now, *you-as-awareness* have "taken on the shape of" the experience of apparently *being-a-person-in-a-world*. This can be conceived of as a *non*-dimensional blanket, within which there are folds (fact-patterns) which represent the world (world-pattern or current state).
- ***The Beach:*** The metaphor of the beach - about metaphors. It is not possible to build a sandcastle which captures within its form both "the beach" and "sand". However, the sandcastle *is* both the beach and sand. You can certainly label one part of the sandcastle "the beach" and another "sand", but the properties of those parts, being of form, will not capture the properties of the beach and sand themselves, which are "before" form. If you forget this, and start building ("thinking") further sandcastles based on those labelled parts, all further constructions and their conclusions are immediately "wrong", fundamentally, even though they may be coherent structures ("make sense") on their own terms.
- ***Patterned States****:* All possible patterns exist eternally with and as awareness, and all patterns always contribute to ongoing experience. However, they differ in their relative intensity, their relative level of contribution. Note that patterns are not located; they are unbounded and everywhere-nowhere, "dissolved" into awareness. The current experiential state, then, is equivalent to a particular distribution of pattern intensities, which you might think of as a set of "facts" which fully define a world or scenario (although those "facts" might be quite abstract, sort of meta-facts). One of those fact-patterns is that of "time passing". That is, a particular state fully defines a sequence of moments which unfold deterministically unless the state is shifted again. In order to shift one's state, one must change the relative intensity of patterns, which is done by *intending*. In this metaphor, "an intention" is a fact-pattern which is to have its relative contribution to experience increased, and "intending" is the intensification of that pattern. There is no method to intending, no mechanism or act involved, and no cause and effect. It is akin to *shape-shifting*. One simply "intends". Intending is *the only cause*; all apparent causes are in fact results of intending, in the form of patterns within a state.

And so on.

> Is there only one consciousness... or are there many minds...

From the above, we see that this question is actually *meaningless*. Not in a dismissive way; this just follows from the nature of awareness not being an object. There are not "many awareness*es" and nor is there "*an* awareness"; there is simply "awareness". The only fundamental fact, the only thing that is always true, is the

fact of the property of *being-aware*. Absolutely everything else is relatively, temporarily, true only. This includes any apparent division or change in time.

Again, we must constantly bring ourselves back to our 1st-person experience, because truly it is the only thing "happening" right now, and check the properties of awareness directly, noticing whether we are imagining a "view from nowhere", and where that imagining is taking place.

> This question bothers me the most simply because it is the hardest to answer, as it would require looking beyond the metaphorical library.

Or, one flips things around? Instead of awareness being in the library, we have that the entire library is dissolved, eternally, within and as awareness - and awareness simply associatively traverses the content, unfolding different pages into the senses, as it were. The *Infinite Grid*, *Hall of Records* and *Imagination Room* metaphors linked in the sidebar try to indicate this shift in perspective (awareness as the *context* to all experiential *content*) too.

The nature of awareness is such that it can't travel anywhere nor change in time, however it can select the content of its ongoing Now, by *shape-shifting* itself via its infinite potential, into any experience, "as if" this or that were true, even thought the only thing that is actually true is awareness itself.

Note: Don't make the mistake of then thinking that awareness "takes on the shape of" multiple people as *beings*, as if they were formed and arranged within some sort of place, who then go about doing things. *You-as-awareness* is the only being, the only intelligence. Everything else is patterns within awareness, which ripple across its metaphorical sensory screen, "as if" there were other people (and *you-as-person*) doing things. All that is actually happening, though, is awareness itself.

Short version: Consciousness doesn't *have* an inherent nature other than the property of "awareness" - and, as infinite potential, the ability to "take on the shape of" any other *apparent* nature.

[...]

Well, I probably do a "constructive rest position" lying down whenever I feel like it, a couple of times a day (lie down on the floor with feet flat and books supporting the head, let go of body and thought and also attentional focus, let things move as they will, 10 minutes). See also the *Overwriting Yourself* post linked in the introduction for some background. Mostly, though, it's just switching attention to an open state, and enjoying experience, whenever in the mood. I don't do a particular formal meditation or anything like that. And: yes, you should participate more often!

Reply to “Change your beliefs change your world”

But what *exactly* is a "belief"? I don't think it's necessarily a straightforward thing to answer, at least not in a way that leads immediately to a strategy for changing one's experience.

> [Q: For me, there exists an interaction between the concept of "intention" and that of "belief". Intention is a specific action that I am capable of performing, through the application of my capacity to will. Belief seems to be then a word used to explain my expectations that I carry around my reality, which in this model would be intentions without active, aware participation. It seems to me that my current expectations about my reality, which are the only practical applications of my beliefs, are limitations upon my ability to intend. In this sense, without active and aware participation, beliefs serve as a proxy for intentions that are created unknowingly, or ignorantly.
>
> In the concept that you can "change your beliefs and change your reality", I would say it is more accurate to claim that becoming aware of, and taking responsibility for, all of your "beliefs" would reveal that your current reality has been created by those intentions that have been occurring without volition behind them, or with an ignorant volition. The true creative power is the intention, or volition.
>
> Looking back at this, and OP's reply above also, it seems the word *belief* is another name for *past intentions*. When you view it that way, and with the goal of most effectively causally affecting reality, to me the most constructive method would be to willfully create new intentions now without regard for "beliefs", rather than attempting to change those patterns of past intentions. In fact, the very act of acknowledging those *past intentions* as a pattern called a *belief*, it is essentially the creation of yet another intention, reaffirming the power of those past intentions.]

I broadly agree with this. I do think that "belief" is probably a word best avoided (see comment above) unless we narrow its intended meaning.

If we instead just go straight for "the patterning of experience" - as an accumulation of intentions, as you say - then we have an actual model to base our approach on, and a line of investigation to explore. Then, we can reserve "belief" for what we think is possible, when we are *thinking about* what is possible. The belief itself does not dictate what is possible, only what range of experiences we are likely to intend.

Obviously, there is some overlap here, since to think about the possibility of something will to some extent intensify that pattern and make it likely to arise - it is a minor intention all of its own, as you say - but that is not what most people mean when talking about the effect of beliefs.

It seems to me that all though all *deliberate* thought has a state-shfiting effect, there is a useful distinction to be drawn between simply *thinking something* (e.g. thinking "owls" for a while) versus *asserting that something is true* (e.g. thinking the fact "owls are filling up my life" until it is fully intensified). Although the process is the same - a pattern is strengthened relatively via attending to it - it's the additional context of the latter which I think deserves the title of *intention* (asserting a fact of the world), as opposed to simply *thinking* (dumb pattern activation).

So, pretty much as you say - except that I'm keeping "belief" as something that refers to the conceptual structure one has *about* the world, and not necessarily part of the factual "world-pattern" itself, because sometimes those two get conflated, leading to a misunderstanding of what is being done. (Which is perhaps why people sometimes wonder why what they believed was going to happen, didn't. They were looking at the wrong "strand of thought", a parallel construction *about* the world, rather than the world itself as their dissolved state.)

> But it is definitely an open question for me, one that I would love more opinions on!

I think this is the point where we realise that one of the hurdles we have, and one of the mistakes we can make, is the initial tendency to confuse the auditory or visual imagery of a thought with *being* the intention rather than simply a sensory *handle* onto it. The intention itself is a *felt-meaning-context* and not necessarily even much of that - a very subtle *knowingness-pattern*. But not that either! It's a dimensionless fact, I suppose. The experiential aspect depends on the intention itself, and more.

We might think of it as a sort of a reverse insight, perhaps?

By this, I mean that sometimes we encounter a situation and suddenly we just *know* the full extent of it. It doesn't come in the form of words and images, and you'd struggle to call it even a feeling as such - it is just *knowing*. When we intend something, what we want to do is sort of create such a *knowing* and intensify it. Of course, we don't actually *have* to do this directly - it's probably much easier to perform a physical or mental act which simply *implies* it - but if we are serious about our experiments, that's where we're heading. Anyway, the more that we release our hold on body tensions and other held patterns which result in ongoing sensory noise - via daily releasing and exploring "just-decide" and so on - and the more we settle out into a nonattached allowing, the more this background *felt-sense* becomes clearer in general and moves into relatively greater prominence.

This is what I was trying to reach for in my early outline post: *The Patterning of Experience*

In the end, the difficulty with defining what "an intention" is and what "intending" is, is that **it is not actually one thing**. If we called it "changing the landscape" then the experience of doing this would depend on the current and final states of the landscape, and whether and in what way we were looking at the part of the landscape we were changing. Changing "flat" to "hilly" would likely have a sensory feeling of "hilliness", for example. If we were standing on the part we were changing, we might have a massive experience of vertigo... but if it were some more distant contour, it might be a much more subtle experience. And so on.

One of my earlier metaphors: If you were a shape-shifter, what would "shape-shifting" be like? And what would be the difference between *thinking about* your target shape, and actually shifting to it and becoming it? Suggestion: the experience would be one of *change*. What we experience when intending is the experience of *shifting*, not of the actual intention/intending itself as such, since these terms do not refer to specific things at all.

TL;DR: An intention is not an object, and intending is not the creation of an object.

[...]

> > I'm going to disagree completely.

I'm not sure that you *are* disagreeing?

My question to ponder was, what is a belief, meaning what is its nature? Is it a structural pattern of our subjective world? Or is it a concept, an abstraction we use when we *think about* our world? Do we sometimes use the latter to refer to the former, but then focus on trying to change the latter? That's what I mean by, without nailing exactly what we mean by "belief", it's not necessarily obvious what it is or how it shapes experience.

For example, if a "belief" is a thought *about* the world that we have, which leads us to take some actions and not others, that is one thing. Altering our beliefs would alter our behaviour, perhaps, but would not in and of themselves alter our "reality" except indirectly. For instance, we "believe that" we are unattractive and so we don't choose to approach that attractive person, or avoid situations where we feel being unattractive will embarrass us.

On the other hand, if a "belief" was bound up with the *actual factual structure* of the world, then to alter our beliefs would be to shift reality itself (using those terms loosely). In this case, it is about more than our beliefs shaping our action choices. We are reshaping the world itself.

How we approach changing our beliefs - or if we even bother to spend time trying to do so - depends on what we think they "are", in this sense. Personally, I think the word "belief" is near to useless, since it is poorly defined and tends to conflate these two things - and more. It is better to avoid it completely and go for a metaphor that is cleaner and has less baggage, and derive our own targeted language from that.

> If we think of ourselves as a lense that views the world our beliefs could be the mud or dirt on the lens.

That's not a bad metaphor, and points to the distinction I was making, perhaps. Dirt on the lens doesn't prevent you taking a particular action *in principle*. However it affects the likelihood of you conceiving of and then taking that action.

> If we believe that we are 'unattractive' then we are. Simple.

Now, this is where I think that, practically speaking, it's useful to separate out those two things. It may be possible for the *world-fact* to be that you are beautiful, but the *thought-fact* to be that you are not. The two do not necessarily line up. Dimensional jumping, as usually outlined, could involve changing the *thought-fact* or changing the *world-fact*. The former would change your behaviour, but not necessarily the reaction. The process is the same, however the intention (the "pattern" that is intensified) is different. However, there is some overlap, because people often approach doing one or the other by using an intentional pattern or image which actually represents part of the other. (Again, why I'm keen to make the distinction.)

> We 'jump' realities all the time, by simply choosing something. Usually our beliefs keep us in a certain pattern of choosing so we stay within the same reality.

See, for me, this is where things break down or getting confusing.

Having *the experience of choosing* isn't the same as shifting state - which is what I would call "changing your reality" - so choosing alone isn't what we're after. What we actually want is to *intend a change of fact*. Sometimes we accidentally link a change of fact to an action (assignment of meaning, "doing this *means-that* that is now true") but mostly our actions arise without any such link, and therefore do not change anything.

This is why sometimes changing a belief (your thought about the world) simply changes the *fact of your thought* and perhaps your likely actions, and why other times it changes the *fact of the world*. Only when we alter a belief while having, perhaps without realising it, decided that doing so *means-that* the world will change, does a change in "reality" occur.

I don't think I've said this very clearly at all, so I'm going to try and summarise what might be a streamlined view:

- The world is a pattern, a list of facts *of* the world, which arises as sensory experience.
- Beliefs are a pattern, a list of facts *about* the world, a parallel construction, arising as a strand of thought.
- Changing a pattern is done by *intending* the change:

  a) Changing a *fact of belief* will alter what thoughts arise in your awareness as your ideas *about* the world, and hence guide what you think is possible, hence what you might subsequently intend.

  b) Changing a *fact of the world*, meanwhile, will alter what sensory experiences arise in your awareness as *the world itself* - what events will apparently occur around you including your spontaneous body actions.
- Since we can do *b*, then there's actually no need for *a*. At worst, we should spend some time intensifying the fact of "believing that *b* is possible" as some sort of broad meta-belief, and then we don't need to worry about any other beliefs at all.

TL;DR: Beliefs don't actually affect what is possible, so perhaps we don't need to worry about them at all?

> your trying to change your physical world in hopes that it will change your inner world

Really, I am starting from the viewpoint that there *is* no inner or outer. In other words, everything arises in "mind", which has no boundary. (It's fairly easy to confirm this directly.)

From this, what we might call the "physical world" is just one particular strand of experience arising in that mind. We might consider this as a "3D-immersive strand of thought" that fills up our awareness. In parallel, also arising in mind, we might have a stand of experience which is our "thoughts *about* the world".

Two strands, both internal and accessible, one arising from the *world-state*, one arising from the *person-state*.

If changing our beliefs corresponds to a change in the *person-state*, then it might lead to a change in what we are likely to intend as a change in the main experience - because we have changed the structure of the "person" part of our experience. However, alternatively, we can simply intend directly onto the main experience itself - the "world" part of our experience.

Basically, I'm suggesting that playing with beliefs, while it can be ultimately beneficial, might be somewhat of a distraction, since it operates in a roundabout way and the meaning of "beliefs" isn't clearly linked to the structure of experience. If it's all internal, then we can simply *assert facts directly*. Don't "believe" that you are attractive, instead directly access the fact and make it true via intention. Again: operate on the world directly.

There is overlap here, since if someone works on their belief of attractiveness then they might actually end up using an intention which asserts the fact - but not necessarily. You can end up having lots of thoughts about being amazing, but not actually being amazing, because you intended new beliefs, not new facts.

Related idea: Why aren't you a precog? When you think about what's going to happen tomorrow, what you believe is going to happen tomorrow, why does it tend not to correspond to what actually happens tomorrow?

> If you don't believe something will happen then it most likely won't.

Why, though? How exactly do beliefs change what is likely to happen? It seems that there is a missing step in that description?

> What is a precog?

Typically in science fiction, someone who has "precognitive abilities" - they can see into the future. I was suggesting (just as a playful idea to explore) that if it was our beliefs that defined the world, then surely we would be able to access the future, since it would simply follow from our beliefs. This suggests that beliefs are just ideas *about* the world. To be a precog, we would want to access the *facts of* the world, the current *world-state*.

> if you don't have a belief that you are a certain way then you can't intent for it to happen.

I don't agree. If you can think of something, then you can intend it, since "an intention" *is* the thought of something being true, and "intending" *is* the intensification of that thought. Believing that you are a certain way doesn't limit your ability to intend otherwise, although believing that you are a certain way *and that it cannot be changed* might mean you don't end up trying. Beliefs are like a model of the world - a parallel construction in thought. Sure, if you use the model to judge what is possible and act/intend only according to what it says, then you'll be limited. Alternatively, you can just ignore it and intend what you want anyway, because the model itself has no causal or restrictive power!

Spending time changing beliefs is just time misspent - all you're doing is using the same intention process that you'll use later to change the world, to just change how you feel, so that you then feel confident enough to intend changing the world. You don't need that stepping stone, though. In the end, the only thing that really changes a belief is the generation of and experience which contradicts your model. So why not go straight for intending a change in contradiction to the model? (That's kinda what the two glasses exercise, etc, are about.)

This is where "faith" comes in. Faith to intend something contrary to your ideas about the world - and faith to not interfere with that intention subsequently, and to see where it leads. Faith being perhaps the only way to get to the meta-belief to rule them all...

Where that leads to is, I suggest: that intention is the *only* process that there is, the *only* operation that ever occurs. Beliefs aren't the "core operating system" of your mind - they're just another static pattern. The world is a patterned landscape of static facts which gives rise to experience; intention is how you change the landscape; there's nothing else.

So I'd phrase it more generally perhaps, and say: intention creates *experiences*, of body movements but also of events. (Remembering that all of your sensory experiences arise in your "mind space", so the car horn "over there" is just as much a part of *you-the-experiencer* as your foot tapping "over here".)

A change in your beliefs then follows naturally from those experiences. You do not need to believe something in order to intend it and have it happen - however, you must at least have the confidence or detachment to resist interfering, since that will be a re-intention.

You can think of each deliberate intention as shifting you onto a new deterministic path, a new sequence of experiences, which then unfold "by themselves" in your awareness, until you re-intend again. Between intentions, the world is "static" in the sense of being like a fixed logical landscape of experiences that you are scanning your attention across.

So, "dimensional jumping" is a metaphor for an intentional change of this landscape, one which shifts it so dramatically that your subsequent experiences are "as if" you had changed to a different universe.

[...]

> > And then it would take a tremendous amount of energy on your part to stretch your energetic field and body that much.

These are some beliefs worth examining, of instance. What is this "energy" stuff, what's my "energetic field" exactly, and how does it relate to my body? In fact, that is my "body" - is it an object, or a collection of sensations which arise in my experience plus a conceptual framework that I've attached to them? And so on.

Reply to “How Limitless is Dimensional Jumping, Really?”

I think the underlying point is, you can be skeptical (as in: reserve judgement and not commit to "it being true or not" prior to getting results or not), but if you approach this half-heartedly then you are not really testing it at all. And conviction is of a piece with intensity of intention, so it might play a part. (The word "belief" is a bit vague in meaning for use here, I think.)

As for confirmation bias and the power of suggestion (?), the answer would be to perform experiments and get results repeatedly until a link between your act and an outcome was proved to your satisfaction. If nothing else, such experiments would be a jumping off point for contemplating how, exactly, "confirmation bias" or "the power of suggestion" would account for your experiences, if that was the view you were inclined towards. Nothing should be "chalked up" to anything one way or the other.

This subreddit absolutely encourages testing things out and taking nothing for granted.

Reply to “Does telling other people interfere with jumping?”

Keep to a subjective perspective here, I'd say. What does telling them imply about your view of the approach, and how will you receive their responses? There's really no benefit to telling anyone, because there's no sense in which they can contribute to your effort - however, seeking confirmation or taking external comments seriously *can* reflect an underlying view, and affect your ability to commit fully to the intention (which is what really matters).

> > I kind of get this; I've discussed the possibilities with my roommates (my girlfriend, and our roommate who is pagan and who commented that the two glasses feels like a spell to him). I've told them that I am planning on trying it, but I likely won't tell them when I do.

Well, a "spell" is just an action you take where you *deliberately* use the fact that: although sensory experiences are apparently *local*, all intentions are actually *global*. It's better to keep things to yourself, because the extended associations that are triggered as/with your intention include whatever worldview elements you have adopted. Better to make up your own mind, and proceed from there, therefore (in my view).

Also, the word choices should arise naturally from *your* own contemplation of the two situations or states. Which is not to say that you can't 'jump together' with people - but really it is a "single-user model" (although not a *personal* model) and is best approached that way I think.

This is not a consensus reality. (Unless you really want it to behave like one, of course, in which case you might have the corresponding "as if" experiences. I would say it's a 'personal preference', but that would probably just be confusing...)

Maybe if we reformat it this way...

Okay, so there is nothing outside of you; you never go anywhere, you just change state. A "dimension" is a metaphor for a more discontinuous change of state (moreso that a "shift" or "manifestation"). And to speak of "each others' beliefs" doesn't really make sense...

However - Generating for yourself the experience of gathering with a group of people, and performing an act, may provide a "plausible excuse" for you to allow changes to happen. You are creating an unusual act to which you can attach extraordinary meaning or causal power. So it can definitely be beneficial in that way. After all, what does staring into a mirror really do? Or pouring some water? An occasion to focus, to intend deliberately, knowingly.

From a comment I made earlier today:

- *Act + Intention + Detachment = Shift*
- Assigning a meaning to an act is what gives it causal power.
- Assigning a meaning to any experience can give it causal power.
- Habitually observed cause-effect relationships are the outcomes of previous assignments or associations.

Where an "act" can be a mental or physical act (since of course they are both the same thing: experience in the mind), and any object is also an aspect of experience. So experiencing "a group of people doing something" is as valid an "enabling act" as any other.

Something to ponder:

- How can you tell whether you have "jumped dimensions" with other people **vs**
  you have "jumped to a dimension" where the versions of those people are just very similar **vs**
  you have changed state but have left those people's patterns intact?

And: does it matter to you?

Actually, my underlying point is that **it's all you** so it doesn't matter how you go about it. What you truly are is the "container" within which all your (apparently) personal experiences appear. You have infinite will, as it were, although you have whatever "formatting" you have accumulated so far. Which is to say, we work within our own preferences and according to our dispositions.

So, gather a group of people if you want to - but *preselect them* according to their enthusiasm and alignment with your intentions. No point gather together aspects of yourself that are antagonists in your story of change (oh my god, what phrasing, heh, sorry).

But the glasses technique doesn't depend on your belief. (In any case, belief doesn't make things happen or not, it just influences whether you actually commit and do something properly in the first place, or whether you later undo it by rewriting it.) Just follow the instructions properly, *including the last point*, and let it take care of itself.

The hardest part of all this is actually being okay with the fact that *the change occurs in the moment you do the exercise*, and that there's nothing more to be done after that. The results will come to you (or rather: you will encounter the results) without further deliberate action.

Reply to “People around us”

> I don't understand how another person can see or understand what is happening when I am jumping and changing myself.

Is that what you experience though? Do you actually experience another person "seeing or understanding" as such?

> how do they comprehend what has just happened

They *don't* comprehend. At least not in the sense of "having an experience" like you are. The important thing to realise, perhaps, is that you are not having an experience *as* a person, you are having a *person-formatted* experience - and this is different. *You-as-person* doesn't have experiences either. Only *you-as-experiencer* or *you-as-awareness* is having - really: "taking on the shape of" - an experience. I'll see if I can clarify that by talking around the subject a little (excuse length).

The Realness of People

Now, this doesn't necessarily mean that people aren't "real", but it does mean that they are not "real" in the sense that you previously assumed them to be (it is worth pausing and pondering what exactly *you* mean when you say the word "real"). They are more like, say, patterns of experience within *you-as-awareness*, as indeed are *you-as-person*. Consider, perhaps, what it is you *actually* experience, versus the stories or descriptions you think *about* experience (which are really just more experiences, of course: the experience of "thinking about experience"). Do you *really* experience yourself as a "person-object" with a "world" that is a "stable, spatially-extended 'place' unfolding in time"? Or is it more like a *line of thought*, unfolding spontaneously in an aware space, albeit a 3D multi-sensory thought?

This latter idea leads us to the similarities between waking life and lucid dreams, which are indeed often conceived of as being essentially an unfolding thought. It is possible, in a lucid dream, to create "persistent realms" which are essentially indistinguishable in vividness and stability from waking life; the only difference is your knowing of the context of the dream. It quickly becomes apparent that they identical in nature. And, of note, within the dream you experience "other people" who apparently know things about the world that you don't, and indeed the whole world is laid out despite you not explicitly defining it.

The Real You

Now, the "you" in a dream obviously isn't the "real you". And so it is in waking life: the experience of being a person isn't the "real you", in a fundamental sense. But are *you* a "figment of your imagination"? Yes and no. While the entire "world-pattern", including "you" and "other people" might be said to be somehow "dissolved into the background" of *you-as-awareness*, this *you-as-awareness* isn't a thing or an object or a being. It is more like a *material*. Essentially, the final observation is something like:

- What you truly are is the non-material material whose only inherent property is the fact of *being-aware*, or "awareness", and which "takes on the shape of" states and experiences. Currently, *you-as-awareness* has "taken on the shape of" the experience of apparently *being-a-person-in-a-world*.
- All possible patterns, facts, situations, experiences, moments, formatting are in effect eternal and always present, "dissolved into the background" of *you-as-awareness*.

- The current "state" of *you-as-awareness* might be described as the current selection of patterns or facts which are presently contributing to your ongoing experience. While all patterns are present, some are relatively more "intense" than others. (This provides one way to think about "intention" and modifying one's experience.)

And so the sense in which everything is a "figment of your imagination" is a limited, because it isn't "your" imagination in the personal sense, and it is not "imagination" in the sense of an ongoing, maintained process. And because "creation is already done", you are only ever adjusting the shape of a metaphorical "world-pattern" landscape; there is never an incomplete world, there is always a complete and self-consistent experience because there are no "parts" to experience.

Feeling and Understanding

Do check out the *Feeling Out Exercise* also. The metaphors might be useful for this query:

> I know that our reality and consciousness and life is so complex that one may never truly understand, but at least we can try.

In fact, you *can't* understand it, and there is no point in trying. By "understanding", there I mean turn it into words or concepts. You can understand it in the sense of simply *knowing* it directly, being it. But you can't create a description which captures it - because descriptions are themselves just more experiences, "within" *you-as-awareness*. Experiencing has no "outside", and so there is no perspective from which to create a model which captures it (see: *The Feeling Out Exercise*, for example).

A metaphor from the second link which tries to illustrate why you can't really ever think yourself into a conceptual understanding of experience:

- ***The Beach:*** The metaphor of the beach - about metaphors. It is not possible to build a sandcastle which captures within its form both "the beach" and "sand". However, the sandcastle *is* both the beach and sand. You can certainly label one part of the sandcastle "the beach" and another "sand", but the properties of those parts, being of form, will not capture the properties of the beach and sand themselves, which are "before" form. If you forget this, and start building ("thinking") further sandcastles based on those labelled parts, all further constructions and their conclusions are immediately "wrong", fundamentally, even though they may be coherent structures ("make sense") on their own terms.

In a way, the problem is that the direct fact of the matter is so *super-simple* that it is impossible to grasp it by anything other than directly attending to your actual experience.

Reply to “In what way are other people real?”

Let me have a go here. It seems that you *perhaps* are still partly identifying as a person, and implying that this person is in a "place" of some sort with other people, and you're saying things like "my awareness". This can lead to an incorrect imagining of the situation, I think.

It is not *your* awareness, I'd suggest. It is just "awareness". What you are, *is* "awareness". That is, that which has as its only fundamental property the property of *being-aware*, and which "takes on the shape of" experiences - including aspects like "spatial extent" and "time passing" - playing out currently as a series of multi-sensory moments. Right now, *you-as-awareness* is "taking on the shape of" apparently *being-a-person-in-a-world*. All that is fundamentally true is *being-aware*, but *you-as-awareness* are having experiences "as if" other things are true.

Pause for a moment and check your actual experience as it is. I suggest it is something like being an "open aware space within which experiences arise" - like you are an unbounded *mind*, with a stable, bright, multi-sensory, 3-dimensional *thought of* being in a world floating within it. In what sense, then, are you a person? What does that *being-a-person* consist of? Surely, it is just sensations, perceptions and thoughts - with the *idea* of being a person occurring from time to time? You don't actually experience *being* a person at all. Other people, similarly, are made from that. Basically, visual, auditory, textural, and so on, aspects and a *felt knowing*.

All of which arises as a *1st-person* perspective. And that's important. That is, as soon as you find yourself thinking about this and imagining the situation from an imaginary 3rd-person "view from nowhere", then you are immediately "wrong". Because you are not *inside* the world; rather the world is inside you, with a particular sensory aspect of it being "unfolded" at any, or *as* any, particular moment.

You are then left with identifying the actual properties of this 1st-person mode - which is all there is. For example:

Feeling Out Exercise

... a little exercise can help give us a direct experience of what it means to be the subject to all experience, to recognise that we are not an object and that we are "unlocated". We might close our eyes and try to:

a) find the "edges" of your current experience.
b) find where "you" are in your current experience. *and:*
c) investigate what your current is experience is "made from". *finally:*
d) think about yourself, and then note the location of that thought and what it is "made from".

The conclusions of this are the *direct facts* of your experience - the only actual facts, really; everything else is transitory. Whatever you *think about* your experience is also another experience within this context. You can never get "behind" or "outside" of this, because it has not edges or boundaries; there *is* no behind or outside. (If you think otherwise, then pause and notice that your thought about this is *also* "within" and "inside".)

This final observation is important. Specifically, that "awareness" is "before" things like division and multiplicity, objects and change, and so it makes no sense to talk of "**an** awareness" or "other people's awareness" or any number regarding awareness at all. There is just "awareness"; uncountable. You can't relate different experiences or perspectives within a framework of time and space, because time and space are

themselves *aspects of an experience*. (Although obviously not accurate, the *Hall of Records* metaphor tries to offer a easy way into envisaging that.)

> it literally felt like I was somewhere in my head, so I had to stop the exercise.

Sometimes it helps, here, to then notice *where, exactly, you are experiencing that location from*.

Sometimes it is discovered that you are sort of "looking at" that felt location from outside of it. Sometimes it is noted that the "feeling of being in your head" is a feeling within a larger field of "feeling-space". Both of which mean, of course, that you are actually *not* just in that location, because otherwise you couldn't be aware of the location within a larger context! You must *be* the context, in order to be aware of a location *within* a context!

As you imply, though, it can be best to just leave things be if they are a struggle, and let it percolate for a while. Occasionally, doing these exercises can feel quite claustrophobic, as you try to "capture" yourself within your attention, and discover that this isn't possible (because your attention is within you, not the other way around). The trick, overall, is to eventually cease trying to *effort* it into getting a conclusion, because efforting is itself a deformation of your "shape", like rippling the water you are trying to see a reflection in.

Anyway, it's good to return to this one now and again even after you've "got" it - it can be very pleasant and relaxing to remind oneself of it when it is noticed we've become "narrowed down".

> Perhaps I should have persisted with the exercise a bit longer. I'll definitely give it another go. What would you say for the first exercise, "feeling the edges" of your experience? Do you mean in the sense, that, when you close your eyes, you try to find the "edges" of the "blackness" that you see, or the "edges" in terms of the "mental space" of the mind?

For the first - words are problematic, I suppose, but I do mean *feel* out, mentally, or with attention, to see if there is a "boundary", an end, to your moment of experience in any direction, and if there are any "edges" to it. It's not a visual thing, particularly. Perhaps *sensing* is a better term to use. "Mental space" is a good enough term, although of course that does presume a result (that there is a mental *space* in the first place). What is concluded - you can check for yourself, definitely don't take my word for it - is that "being" has no edges or limits, but also that it's not necessarily got spatial extent either. So perhaps "openness" or "void" ends up being the way to describe it, with your current spatially-extended sensory moment floating within that.

Ultimately, we're just noting that the idea of an "inside" or "outside" to experience is meaningless because, as we've just explored with the "where am I?" thing, any discovery of an "inside" already implies that you are the context of that "inside", and so you are the "outside" too, and that is also within/as you. This then helps us note, again, that "sensory experience" and "thoughts" are of the same nature, further emphasising that thoughts *about* an outside are themselves just more experiences within/as us ("inside"). You can see, here, how lots of the usual questions we might have asked earlier become nonsensical. By the time you get to the end of it, questions about "inside" and "outside" have resulted in answers which make those two words quite problematic to use! **The answers actually *destroy* the questions!**

[...]

> [Q: Every time I read one of your posts lately I feel like we are on two opposite sides of a coin. I read something and my immediately reaction is "That's not right at all!" then two seconds later it says "Oh wait, no I see what you mean, your just looking at it from the other side". There have been a few of

> them like this lately, that I have difficulty reading and then suddenly have a flash of intuition of "I don't know what he's saying, but I know exactly what he means". It seems like your approach "pulls out while pushing in" while mine does the opposite. Instead of pulling out to find the edges of my awareness, I envision pulling inwards to a core identity. From there I ask what is the "he/she/they" that exists before my pattern is placed on top of it to filter it. In that sense another person is a core identity that my belief puts through a filter.
>
> As I see my core identity as multifaceted and capable of anything, so must the other person be. So in that sense if I go from a reality where a person dislikes me to one where they like me, I didn't change them because between my core/higher self and that persons we've established agreements on how to express all of those energies and let out awareness choose the ones we want.]

It's sort of both, simultaneously, really, the "pulls out / pushes in". It's that thing of there being "no-thing" but also "all possible patterns, pre-existing and eternal", at the same time. And you could look at people that way, too: that the "larger person" is all possible versions of that person, and you're just seeing one "aspect". To some extent, though, we're just playing with descriptions there, but I think it gives an intuitive way of thinking about the sort of experiences it is possible to have.

Reply to “What happens to this me when I jump?”

There *is* no other you - see sidebar for some metaphors which help get to grips with that. It might be useful for you to pause and contemplate what, *exactly*, you mean by "you" when you ask this question.

When I ask what "you" are, I am hinting that you are not actually a person at all, but rather you are an "awareness" that is having, or taking on the shape of, a *being-a-person-in-a-world* experience. So, "dimensions" is a metaphor by which extreme change is understood and intentions constructed. You never go anywhere, because you aren't anywhere to start with. What you are changing, then, is the shape of your current experience such that it is "as if" you were jumping "dimensions". Right now, you are having an experience "as if" you were a person in a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time". Performing a "jump" corresponds to creating an intentional discontinuity in that experience, so that it better matches the experience you want.

As for the nature of the overall experience, that's the underlying purpose of the subreddit I'd say.

Very broadly speaking, the thing you learn is that your descriptions and assumptions about the world are "parallel constructions in thought" and don't have much to do with the *world-as-it-is* - unless you formulate your intentions based upon them (and thereby imply them as part of that intention, in a bit of a feedback loop). This obviously leads to some interesting conclusions about the nature of experiencing, and about yourself. You really have to play around with experimenting, though, along with reading alternative metaphors, to get a sense of this. Just thinking about it can often amount to going round in circles in your current "castle in the sky" (habitual description of the world), from the inside of which other perspectives pretty much by definition can seem nonsensical.

There's no such thing as "awareness**es**". You are not *an* awareness; you are just "awareness", which is "before" division and multiplicity. Just as there is no awareness "inside" *you-as-person* (rather, *you-as-person* is a collection of sensations, perceptions and thoughts arising *within as as* awareness), there is no awareness "inside" other people. *People* cannot have experiences; they are not "beings". What a person is, is a pattern of experience.

Note, thinking about this is inherently problematic, since thought itself comes "after" division and multiplicity. As soon as you start thinking about this, you are immediately in error - the best you can do is recognise the problems, and include it in the description to avoid making the obvious implicit errors.

> What do you mean here? Division and multiplicity of what?

By this, I'm referring to the fact that "awareness" is not an object, it's more like a "material whose only inherent property is *being-aware*". It has no particular spatial or temporal properties, unless it takes on the shape of those properties. Spatial extent and unfolding change, then, are properties of *experiences*, not of the awareness itself. Therefore, it is meaningless to talk of many experiences "happening" simultaneously, or in different places.

This leads to something important when it comes to discussing this topic: although awareness can always *be* itself, it cannot create an image of itself. So we can never describe the fundamental situation, and we must be aware that all our *thought-about* it can mislead us, because they are pre-formatted into objects related in mental space.

In the metaphor of the beach, we might say that it is not possible to build a sandcastle which represents "the beach" and "sand". A sandcastle always *is* the beach and sand, but it cannot *capture* them. The beach is "before" sandcastles while also *being* all sandcastles. At best a sandcastle can sort of point to the beach/sand by implying them, basically by indicating that it is *not* them - "not this, not that" - just as this metaphor is doing.

> So other people and myself are patterns of experiences. How do I relate to the people who I experience in (what I perceive to be) my life? And how does the act of changing one's experience patterns through "dimensional jumping" affect the experience of others?

The thing to note, here, is what you mean by the "I" in relate. The "I" that experiences things is not *you-as-person*, which is just a particular experiential pattern within *you-as-awareness*. In fact, it is important to say that it doesn't so much experience something, as "take on the shape of" an experiential state; *you-as-awareness* becomes the state. So there are no experiences of "others", just as *you-as-person* isn't having an experience. The experience is that of awareness, and nothing is "happening" other than that.

> Are other people as real as I am?

You need to define what you mean by "real" - but yes, "other people" are real as *you-as-person*. That is, patterns that are a part of the extended world-pattern. Calling them "other people" can be a bit misleading, though: the personal experience that is happening right now isn't that of being a person, it's that of "having a person-formatted experience". On that basis, *all* people are "other people", including the person you thought you were - but also, all people are you.

> Is it some kind of solipsism?

No, I'd say, because we are not saying that you are the only person that exists, nor that "your mind" is all that exists - since it is not *your* mind. In effect, we are saying that although awareness might take on experiential states "as if" there is a world full of people, or even "as if" there is just one person, in fact none of these things is absolutely true (its nature is awareness itself); they are all relatively true (awareness has taken on the shape of it, temporarily).

So, we've got to the idea that "all that is, is awareness", but because it is not an object or a personal awareness, then it is not solipsism as it is usually presented. As we've seen, it can't actually even be thought about: any ideas about awareness are immediately incorrect. (One can have direct insight, just a direct recognition of the situation, but one can't model it or work it out or solve it by effort, since to do so immediately deforms the experience.)

> Are we all actually the same "awareness"?

Basically: yes, but with the caveats above (that "you" and "we all" are not fundamentally how you might have previously considered them).

Awareness is all that there is, fundamentally. It's the only thing that never changes, in the sense of the fact of its existence, so it is the only thing that is capital-T True. All other facts exist eternally, but can rise and fall, can vary in their relative contribution to experience, so they are only relatively true, relative to each other in a state. Which is what things like "jumping" are pointing to: *you-as-awareness* can take on a state such that experiences follow "as if" certain facts were true.

Reply to “Dimension jumping in the hands of the wrong people”

The standard answer to this is that, *in effect*, everybody has a "private copy" of the world. There are no other people who can intend an experience for you - all experiences are explicitly or implicitly the outcome of intensions by yourself, deliberately or not. This doesn't not mean that you have specifically chosen everything that has happened to you; rather, it suggests that your experience consists of the patterns you have intensified, knowingly or unknowingly, plus their logical extensions.

If, for the sake of argument, there *were* other people who could intend bad things as a part of your expeirence, surely you could solve this easily, by intending that they weren't bad anymore?

Firstly, just to emphasise generally (although you do pick up on this):

None of the things discussed in this subreddit should be just *believed*. There's no specific worldview that's being pushed, even - except the "meta" worldview that no *thoughts-about* the world capture the *world-as-it-is*. Everything else is up for debate. (For example: I, personally, don't really "believe" anything fundamentally, in principle, other than my own direct experience. Descriptions are *useful*, but they are *parallel* to the main experience. And so on.)

The idea, then, is that you put aside *any* assumptions you might have, pay attention to your direct experience as it is, contemplate it a bit more deeply than normal, draw your own conclusions. It's an exploration of "the nature of experiencing", albeit hopefully with some happy side-effects. But the getting of what you want isn't really the main purpose; it's more about the getting of why there was the experience of getting.

But it always comes down to this, to reiterate:

- Never "trust" anyone in these matters, but don't "distrust" either; be a skeptic in the true sense. Take inspiration from others' ideas, then check them out for yourself. And if something doesn't work or make sense after you've given it a go, you put it aside. Or equally just don't bother in the first place, if it doesn't seem interesting or worthwhile; that's fine too. (Just don't draw any conclusion one way or the other based on not trying.)

I'm repeating that because the only way someone can cross the line between just fantasising about some concepts and actually experiencing something, is to **actually do some experimenting**. As I said earlier, concepts are just "parallel constructions" that give us a framework to think in - and that applies to both your everyday notion of the world *and* these alternative frameworks. They are not "true", the only thing that is "true" is direct experience. If you confirm things for yourself, though, you don't need to worry about that.

Let me say this, though: *I am completely sincere about this topic and I wouldn't waste my time in discussions if I didn't feel others might find it interesting and beneficial too.*

Meanwhile, unfortunately, the language can start to get a bit abstract sometimes, especially at those times when the topic is based on an idea or observation that isn't being explicitly stated. The phrases get all "mystical" without any apparent grounding. And sometimes we're just pushing a philosophical line of inquiry to see where it goes, asking provocative questions that are a bit awkward. If stuff doesn't make sense, though, question it (like this). And if someone can't answer properly, then maybe they *are* talking bollocks! :-)

So, anyway -

> But when you say things, like consciousness is eternal or I am the only one in existence, it gets me really trippy and I don't see how you or anyone could possibly 100% confirm that it is true.

To understand this, we need two things, I'd suggest:

1. The direct observation of what your ongoing experience is actually like, rather than what you *think about* it being like. This direct experience is what a lot of this is built on. Words simply point to experiences; if you've not had the experience of "a soft texture" then no description of it or idea based on it is going to be meaningful to you, for example.
2. To be clear about what we mean by something "existing". (Ponder this?)

It turns out that the first one leads us to think of the second one differently, since it adds a new context that is "before" our usual default understanding of the world. This in turn changes the type of metaphors we use to construct out descriptions. Specifically, we are confronted with the problem of pointing to something which is "before" our usual models. And that's where we start saying thing like "eternal", "undivided", and all the other things that it is *not*. Without the experience, though, and the philosophical line of questioning that follows from it, that seems like mystical nonsense that makes "zero "sense" - just as you say! :-)

One metaphor that helps us avoid being *incorrect*, even though it can't capture the actual situation, is to start talking about the world as a "shared resource of patterns" rather than a "shared place or environment". The more you experiment with things, the more you find yourself needing something akin to an "abstract patterning" and "private copy" framework in order to think about it. But that arises from the observations, created as a useful tool; it is still not something to ever *believe* in as being *fundamentally* true.

> We all have layers inside us, and I always wonder about the hidden truths about other people, but I digress.

It's actually an interesting thing, forums like this, because I think most of the people we are having conversations with probably *don't* discuss this sort of thing with the people they know in real life. Even just the philosophical aspects. Not necessarily because it's secret; actually, few people are interested in pondering such things. This subreddit has about 7k subscribers - *from the entire world*. What are the chances of knowing another one of those people? And then, what are the chances you'd end up broaching this subject? Who knows *what* could be going on in the mind of passing strangers and random people in coffee shops! :-)

From my own experience, I know a couple of people, but not many are really interested in digging around. Most folk - and this is totally fine - are looking for some sort of technique to get a result, or are looking for enlightenment but think it is some sort of feel-good state, rather than a realisation of something.

> You don't necessarily believe all these metaphors and other "truths" you speak of if you don't have any direct experience with it.

I find the whole idea of "belief" a bit of a distraction. It's in the same category as "existence". We assume we know what it means, until we actually look and check what it is that we mean!

The way I'd maybe separate it out is:

1. There is the **fundamental truth** of the "nature of experiencing". This is the *context* of experience. You can directly observe it because you always are it. This is "what experience is made from". It is *always* true and *always* the same. You can't really describe this in words, because it is "that which

words and thought are made from"; you can only be it and know it directly. For convenience, sometimes it is described as the "open space of awareness".

2. There is the **relative truth** of what you are experiencing. This is the *content* of experience, arising in "open awareness". Typically, you might consider that there is:

    - A "main strand" of experience, where you are experiencing *being-a-person-in-a-world*. This is a sort of 3D-immersive multi-sensory strand of thought which fills up your awareness.
    - There is the occasional parallel strand of experience where you are thinking *about* the main experience. This tends to be sort of localised in a sub-region.

    In both cases, these are *coherent* - they are self-consistent like a continuous pattern made from one piece of cloth - but because they have no inherent permanence, they change, they are not *fundamentally* true.

It makes no sense to talk of "believing" in something as such, because if you are thinking *about* something then it is a parallel strand. Meanwhile, if you are experiencing something then you *know* it. So there is a difference between knowing what you think about the world, and knowing the state of the world directly. You might say that every strand of *content* has its own "relative truth", and then there is the *context* which is "fundamentally true".

Where it gets interesting, though, is that it suggests a certain potential: since the main strand is no different in nature to the parallel strand, then just as it is possible to use intention to pattern your thinking, it might be possible to pattern your main strand of experience in the same way. Your main strand, it could be suggested, is just a sort of *unbounded thought* unfolding in awareness, albeit a quite stable and intense one, and you can "think it" differently.

However, only personal experimentation could show whether that's a valid way of approaching it.

> When I read these ideas and metaphors, I don't immediately take them as fact but I don't immediately disprove them either. I mull over them and sort of let them "float" around in my head. I never set anything in stone as a "fundamental truth" because as you said they are still only "parallel thoughts" about this world.

Right. That's how I treat these things. If you just view everything as "interesting ideas" that might come in handy, then you don't need to judge them in any fundamental way at all. In fact, it's sort of meaningless to do so. Their value is as a source of creativity and curiosity. After all, even concepts which appear to map directly to aspects of ongoing experience are not really "right", they are just "self-consistent" (although there often seems to be a tendency to treat them as being more deeply "correct").

> I guess I jumped the wagon on this one and immediately thought about all the materialistic stuff I could get, when this is far more spiritual and about self discovery than anything else. I don't really know where to start though, do you meditate? If so, what are your techniques and how often?

I think it's totally fine to get excited about the possibilities! "Materialistic stuff" consists of experiences just like anything else, including spiritual stuff.

Personally, I don't really meditate. I do a daily releasing exercise, that's about it. Lie down, let everything unravel as it wants without interfering. In terms of better perceiving our experiences, I think it's good to go for it directly: simply by attending to the experience you are having, and looking for that open space, you will shape yourself into it.

So, spending time just closing your eyes, "feeling out" in to the space around you, and exploring the content of your experience - where "you" are, what sensations, perceptions and thoughts are floating in your experience, that sort of thing - is all good. The lesson we derive from that isn't that we find some ultimate state; rather we discover we are *all* states, and that we shift into any state by "taking on the shape of" that state. The fundamental truth is, funnily enough, always true!

> You didn't answer the part of the question I was looking forward to lol, but I didn't expect you to either.

Well, you *knew* I was just going to tell you to explore things for yourself, right? ;-)

There's no confirmation of anything other than self-confirmation. You totally seem to get it: thinking about stuff is a different thing to actually exploring it. At the very least, I can promise you that it will be interesting and will add an extra layer to daily life that will make it more enjoyable; beyond that, you can extrapolate things and see how far you can take them, if you want to. The posts here and at subs like /r/glitch_in_the_matrix should act as a source of inspiration, perhaps.

On meditation, well it sort of depends what you think it is and what you are trying to achieve - and there are many sorts. Lying down on the floor every day, sometimes sitting, and doing nothing - by which I mean ceasing to interfere with movement of body, thought and attention - *is* basically Zen meditation. Generally, if someone is meditating in the hope of enlightenment, I'd say don't bother. (But I'd also say: don't pay too much attention to what I say!) Understanding the nature of experience is something you pretty much *infer* and then confirm. But it's worth doing something (daily releasing exercise) to get experience of allowing things to move spontaneously "by themselves", since that helps dissolves people's tendency to continually re-assert their current position, in opposition to the flow towards outcomes they have intended.

Ha, the phrase "end game" makes it all sounds like a nefarious plan for world domination! :-) Well, there isn't one. It's interesting in and of itself. Having these discussions can make it sound like it's the most important thing, but really it's not; your ongoing experience is what's most important. Having insight into our incorrect assumptions of how things are is great, but beyond that there's: living. I think we have to be careful we don't spend *all* our time contemplating and meditating, and forget to drink beer and go to art galleries (or whatever). :-)

There's a good book called *Ideokinesis* by Andre Bernard, a dance teacher who taught imagery and spontaneous motion approaches (it's related to this topic). At one point in a class, as Bernard is discussing his ideas, a guy asks "but what's this *for?*". And a girl responds: *"It's for life!"*. And *that* is the end game and it's the *only* game, no matter forms it takes, I think.

I have to agree, I think it's great that these communities can pop up, and people from all over the world can find overlap and exchange their thoughts and experiences. Even a decade ago, this wouldn't have been possible in quite the same way.

[...]

Everything you say is pretty normal, right? I think anybody who ponders the world and how things are, explores those thoughts. And it's even fine to get carried away with things - *but* keeping mind that thinking about stuff *is also just another experience*, a parallel construction, and the larger lesson is that there is no fundamental "how things are".

It's if you find yourself dedicating too much time looking for "the final secret knowledge", when really the so-called mystery is just rooted in the fact of moving your arms and mundane everyday stuff like that, that you need to watch out. *Experimenting*, yes, because that is exploring experience. Just *thinking about* things, making up parallel fantasy worlds only, that's what we have to be wary of (unless we do it *knowingly* for fun, that's different; that's art).

As one of the originating mods of /r/oneirosophy, obviously I'm all for it! But it's important to keep it in perspective: those are philosophical discussions about the possibilities inherent in the subjective idealist view. Such things can be empowering, but only if they are used as creative inspiration for deliberate exploration. There is fun in just thinking things out too, but there's a reason that the sidebar here explicitly encourages trying out a couple of exercises, and underlines that explanation and descriptions are *metaphors*.

Whether "enlightenment" is the way to go, kinda depends on what you think "enlightenment" is? It's becomes such a vague term I think. What do *you* think of when you read that word?

Definitely, I'd agree that having an understanding of "the nature of experiencing" is a good thing, but that's relative straightforward, albeit not easy to put into words: you are "that" whose only inherent property is *being-aware* and which "takes on the shape of" experiences.

The *real* issue we face is, that we don't see the whole of our state unpacked into the spatially-extended senses all at once; this makes it harder to develop faith that intending = reshaping ourselves = shifting state = updating facts both *now* and *then*. In other words, that intending to move your arm (effectively: "it is true *now* that I will experience my arm moving *then*", where "then" is about half a second) is identical to intending any other experience ("it is true *now* that I will experience receiving my top grade *then*"). Again, only actual experimentation can reveal whether that is actually true or not. Thinking about it just produces *yet more* descriptive schemes (because that is what the implicit intention of thinking is).

[...]

> those with good intentions and good deeds live in squalor...

All of this might be somewhat self-fulfilling, I suppose. However, it might be interesting to explore this bit: *Which* good intentions and good deeds, specifically? What counts as those? And how are those apparent people going about it? Also, what power would or could such people have over other people's circumstances?

If everything is in your experience, what are you doing about it? Wanting is fine, but that amounts to *thinking-about* the world - and often in ways that imply the current state rather than a target state. Note that, also, it might be the case that mere action doesn't help: the intention to experience acting is one thing, the intention to experience outcomes is another. And so on.

Maybe if we take one strand of that and run with it? Specifically, the idea that "spirituality" is a good outcome for the world, in and of itself. (I dislike that term, it seems pretty much meaningless, but I can't think of another one that doesn't require lots of explanation.)

If one spends time studying the nature of things, what happens? One reaches a greater understanding of what ongoing experience actually consists of; hopefully, a clear and direct awareness of what you actually are as the *context* of experience as well as the *content* of experience is the result.

But does this necessarily alter the content? Make the world better? Well, no, not inherently. Realising that, say, everything that arises in your perspective is made from "consciousness" doesn't change anything at all; it merely shifts your understanding of your nature and the nature of the world. There may be a bit of a shift due to relaxation and acceptance, but perhaps nothing substantial beyond that.

Furthermore, you likely realise that content and consciousness itself contain no judgement about things being good or bad. It not only doesn't care, it doesn't even know what caring is. It doesn't actually *know* anything; it just *is* everything. Everything just "is"; one pattern is equivalent to another. Patterns are added to patterns, the world shifts, it has no intelligence in and of itself. *You* are the only intelligence and *you* are the only thing that "acts".

So at best, "spirituality" offers a new perspective on self and world. It doesn't necessarily lead to good *or* bad things; that's outside of its remit.

"Do you think there's too much suffering in the world?"
"I think there's just the right amount."

So a couple of thought-provokers:

- Having come to an understanding, *after that* is where the decision to do something or not, and what that something will be, becomes relevant. The understanding itself accomplishes nothing.
- If you want to be wealthy, maybe you just *do* have to become a banker or a lawyer? Because that's how *you* made this world! ;-)
- Perhaps trying to reformat this world is a mistake. You've already created this world as it is, unwittingly. Are you seriously going to completely disrupt the patterns of all these pre-existing people without their permission? That seems selfish.

  Equally, you could perhaps think about switching out of this experience and into another - but a moment's thought indicates that this amounts to the same thing: reformatting your experience *is* reformatting these people. Even more selfish! :-)
- Why does it matter so much to you, the way the world is, and your judgement of it? And are you not basically judging yourself anyway by doing so?

For convenience, I guess we should ditch the "soul" and "spirit" terminology, because I think it has clashing connotations, particularly in terms of being located in an independent space somehow, or within something, or whatever.

"Nonlocal self" is a nice term, but I tend to go with something like "open awareness" simply because it has the feeling of being "before" arrangement in space; experiences arise within it, as spatially-extended senses, but it does not itself have a location nor extension nor boundaries. But anyway, I guess we're talking from the same idea really: *that which experiences, and that which experiences are made from*.

I suppose, first, we need to firmly recognise that if the world was the result of our cumulative intentions, then it was not done deliberately. Simply focusing on a pattern would intensify its contribution, and that in turn would intensify its extended pattern of logical implications. For example, if I focus on the existence of a tree, then that logically implies soil and water and sunlight and birds and an ecology: an entire world immediately springs from that thought, is implied by it. We wouldn't say that we *meant* to create that world; but nevertheless our act of increasing the contribution of one pattern did result in that world's (relative, apparent) creation.

So, now there's a world.

For certain, you can't "escape" from that world - because you are not actually *in* that world. What can you do instead?

> *"if the world was the result of our cumulative intentions, then it was not done deliberately";* but it must be, mustn't it?

Hmm, I'll be clearer on that. I don't mind it's not *originating* from/as you; I was talking about whether you are doing it *deliberately* - having a conscious purpose in mind. So, if you are focusing on the image of a tree, but do not understand that doing so corresponds to intensifying a tree and triggering all the associations, then you have not *deliberately* created a world. When people talk about there being a "purpose" to the world they find themselves in, and the troubles they are going through, they are implying that there is a reason - a reason that was consciously chosen, to teach a lesson (or whatever). But that's not the case. The world you have ended up in, while a result of a series of intentions, was basically an accident, because you didn't *know* that you were intending or what the nature of the world is.

The world is not intelligent - ***you*** **are the only intelligence.** So if you act out of ignorance, there is no correcting system that is managing things afterwards. The world itself amounts to a "dumb patterning system" that simply has its eternal patterns intensified or dissolved with no say in the matter.

> in the same way that even if i died, why wouldn't i then 'respawn' in the same/similar world and carry on after the point at which i'd died beforehand.

No reason why not, necessarily. Although, if you have a firmly patterned idea of death being the end of life, then the logical implication of a death scenario for you might be that all memory of the current person is effectively lost to you, and the next thing that appears in your awareness is the experience of being born as another person. If your intention to live as your current person is strong, then perhaps instead of that you'd experience a discontinuity, such that the car crash suddenly didn't happen, or you survived after all, or whatever (perhaps with some collateral shift side-effects).

> the only conclusion i've arrived at is to create the world with purpose

Right. And as you say, this is tied in with knowledge. The realisation that is required, to be purposeful rather than accidental (see above), is to understand the relationship between world, self and intention-implication. But having got that?

You are essentially talking about thinking new facts into the world, updating the relative balance of constituent patterns, *or* allowing this "world-pattern" to fade relative to another world-pattern which you seed with an intention.

> ...so i'd like to have the experience of creating portals and then the experience of overtly changing the world...

Which is where intending *base formatting* comes in, rather than just intending *outcomes*. The latter is simply overlaying a target pattern on pre-existing structures (giving "plausible results albeit by unlikely apparent routes"); the former would be a more "meta" targeting of the landscape of potential routes itself.

I'd say you want to create a similar experience to an OBE, stripped of the "astral body leaving my physical body" concept, instead *knowing-that* everything is a movement of experience as a whole, and *imagining-that* going through a portal is a state transition. If you really spent time with it, I guess you could just choose a doorway and have that represent the state change (which is something that people do for minor facts anyway).

Actually, the "Infinite Grid" animation was initially conceived of as a way to create a structured imagination object that could be used for changes via "translation" - it's not dissimilar to the "OBE you don't come back from" concept, if you think about it.

Yes, I meant "translation" in the mathematical sense rather than the language sense: shifting your location on the metaphorical grid of possibilities, while keeping your identity intact.

Well, that's the trick, isn't it? There *is* no how - it's just intention. You need to *imagine-that* it is happening until the relative intensity of that imagining is stronger than the things you have imagined (intended and implied) thus far.

[...]

Well, "esoteric material" was one of the "sensitive subjects" on the list for David Cameron's ISP-level filtering drive:

> "As well as pornography, users may automatically be opted in to blocks on "violent material", "extremist related content", "anorexia and eating disorder websites" and "suicide related websites", "alcohol" and "smoking". But the list doesn't stop there. It even extends to blocking "web forums" and "esoteric material", whatever that is. "Web blocking circumvention tools" is also included, of course."
>
> -- *Cameron's internet filter goes far beyond porn - and that was always the plan*, New Statesman, 23 December 2013

Now, supposedly those filters are opt-in, and there's been a lot of messing around in this are over the last couple of years which makes it hard to tell what *exactly* has happened, but at the very least the *ability* to select and block was probably but in place. Meanwhile, clauses in the current Draft Investigatory Powers Bill specifically deal with preventing companies from revealing that they have been ordered to interfere with equipment and data. Since it's accepted that this bill is an attempt to legalise behaviour that was already taking place - to normalise it so that it can be used more directly and openly - it wouldn't necessarily surprise me if blocking was already happening, silently.

So basically: it's not a conspiracy, it's a documented fact that the British Government has sought to create, and must already have put in place, filtering capability related to "esoteric material", which would include "the occult" and probably many other things which you and I wouldn't even consider that far from the mainstream. Whether it is active or not, and in what sense, is debatable.

> That's incredible. I wonder what the official spin would be if Dodgy Dave was directly questioned about why society should be threatened by 'esoteric material'. It's all supposedly 'magical thinking' nonsense anyway so how could they justify this.

I think it's actually just part of a broader notion of anything that contradicts Conservative (the party variant rather than general conservatism) ideology. It's not specifically about being anti magical thinking - in fact, they are massively prone to engaging in it themselves, and not the "good" kind.

It's not as if they are great followers of scientific evidence, after all; they regularly discard research and evidence and plough on with ideologically-driven legislation. They generally quite keen to silence all contrary narratives, even when from their own advisors, and scientific bodies generally.

That's an interesting point about "learn from within yourself". I definitely think it's very important that a person knows how to reflect upon and explore their experiences and think through their meaning - rather than accept a conclusion given to them. Not that many people seem to want to do it, though.

It's definitely the viewpoint of this subreddit - try things out, ponder for yourself, don't take anyone else's word for anything (not because they might be misleading you, but because your own experience might differ or your own interpretation might lead to different conclusions). While it might be tempting to have others think on your behalf, in fact *nobody* can think on your behalf of your perspective. (So we shouldn't be too surprised when, say, power groups don't act in our interests: even if they aren't being selfish, at best they can operate on an *simplified idea* of who you are as a collective.)

Reply to “Has anyone used dimensional jumping against somone else?”

> however there's a karmic debt created that has to be accounted for.

Really? What makes you say that? Who or what does the accounting, how is payment enforced, and why would it operate in terms of our human conception of goodness or badness? Is there some external intelligence at work in this? So: The notion of "karma" as some sort of ongoing tally of "goodness" shouldn't be taken for granted, I think. For instance, it might make more sense to conceive of it more like "the persistence of intentional patterns". So, if you intend an outcome of "bad things" for someone, then you may experience the general pattern of "bad things" in your ongoing experience thereafter (similar to how the "owl" pattern arises in a general way in the *Owls of Eternity* exercise). However, the solution to that would be to be more specific in your intention, to deliberately structure it with this in mind, thereby avoiding a generalised "bad stuff" patterning. I think we have to be careful not to end up simply repeating things in a superstitious way - e.g. karma payback, magick is evil, all that - without digging deeper into the actual structure of those ideas. Personally, I'd say that there is nothing necessarily stopping you from harming "other people", no necessary reason why you suffer as a result of doing so. However, it's obviously not a very "nice" thing to do!

There's also the additional aspect that "other people" might be best interpreted as being aspects of *you-as-awareness* - your own extended pattern! - so you are really mangling your own state by doing things like this. If such power is available to you, then surely there are better ways to tackle whatever issue one is seeking to address.

Okay, so if I'm understanding correctly, what you are going for here is less like the general "negative energy" spiritual accounting concept, and more along the lines of a physics style "conservation of energy" principle.

However, aren't you muddling two different things here? That is, the abstract concept of "emotional energy" and the concepts of "kinetic and potential energy" as used in physics (as well as, perhaps, difference ideas of "charge")?

Regardless, we're left with the issue of tying such a model back to our actual ongoing direct experience. In physics, for example, "energy" isn't a real thing as such: it isn't observed and it doesn't do anything, it's pretty much an accounting principle which carries across different types of observations, as a handy connecting concept. It is used because it helps the sums work out - and the sums can be tested against actual (if somewhat constrained) observations, and the models tweaked accordingly. In *this* case, though, how can we tie this description to our direct experience? What *specific* observations can be made, to ensure that this description is worthwhile, and that we should be using it to judge whether there is actually a "karmic" issue to worry about? What would convince someone to follow it? While we might say that there is "no belief required" *within the description*, there is still some level of belief involved in the very assertion that this description is accurate! To some extent, of course, this last part isn't really a problem: *no* description should really be taken too seriously, as "what is really happening". However, if we are going to assert a description is useful at all, it's appropriate to push back on it and ask in what way *exactly* they should be deemed as worthwhile or useful. (For example, the "meta" model of "experiential patterning" is useful because it can be directly experimented with and offers a simple conceptual connection to direct experience, even though of course it is not "true" as such.)

In terms of OP's post, it still remains open I think: in what way does the concept of "karma" actually matter to someone who wants to intend (what they interpret to be) a harmful outcome?

(It's just good to really dig into this, rather than to perhaps skip over our assumptions.)

Aside - I suppose it's worth us reminding ourselves that physical models aren't "what is really happening" either, of course; they are useful metaphors only. For example: *the world* isn't made from atoms, only "the world" (an idea) is made from "atoms" (a conceptual framework). So what in fact matters most about a "karmic" model is whether it is *useful*, rather than true, because it is inherently not possible for it to be true. At the moment, though, I'm not sure we've got much further than the idea that "intending bad outcomes might produce unpleasant penalties", which I think we have cast doubt on now, or "taking action always implies resultant change", which is a tautology.

> >Tautology is an excellent explanation.

Actually, to some extent this is *the* key point that we keep coming back to. That is, the nature of descriptions themselves. All descriptions are to a certain extent "castles in the sky": the manner in which they are "true" is mostly in the sense of "conceptual truth", which is really just another way of saying their are internally consistent. This, as distinct from what we might call "direct truth", the actual experience that is present, now (although this is not just limited to the "sensory moment" that is now). The link between the two, we might term "observational touchpoints" - the ropes that link the content one experience (the experience of "thinking about concepts") to another (the experience of "this main strand of sensory unfolding").

So, my issue with the theory of karma outlined above - aside from my reservations of mixing different concepts of "energy", although I do get what you are going for there, which is that all experience must have a counterpart in the physical model if they are to share a conceptual space - would be that it is tautological in the sense of being primarily "conceptually true" (self-consistent) without sufficient "observational touchpoints" in order to make it useful as a pointer towards "direct truth". Basically, that it might ultimately be more of a *narrative* than it is a *model*, I suppose.

> >I don't see how they're two different concepts. Emotional energy is every bit the same energy identified in physics.

I think that "emotional energy" is generally used as a metaphor to describe a particular subjective sensation associated with an emotional state. Whereas in physics "energy" is an accounting principle associated with (loosely speaking) the position of particles in a particular context. These are two different conceptual frameworks, really. "Emotional energy" doesn't translate to a "physical world" energy unless we explicitly redefine it. Which we might be able to do, of course - but we can't just hand-wave it.

> >Where would emotional energy come from if not from physical energy?

That rather presupposes that the two conceptual frameworks are compatible, and/or that one of them (physical energy) is somehow "real" and foundational. The proper answer is probably that "emotional energy" doesn't come from *anywhere* in terms of "physical energy". And to some extent, from anywhere at all! Again, unless we redefine "emotional energy", to have a version of it in a physical model. This sounds picky, but:

> >The term "energy" is vague...

Not if we choose to be specific in how we are using the term, and in the mechanics of how it is being applied in our descriptions!

> >This presupposes that one must worry about their karmic issues at all.

Perhaps, but:

> >Even if we didn't worry about them; even if we just stomped along blindly without regard to the benefits or harm we're creating, the energy and its correlating effects can still be mapped out from start to finish.

This rather presupposes that there is such a thing as *karmic energy* at all! The effects are "only mapped out from start to finish" if there truly is such a thing, and right now its existence is what we are debating. If it doesn't exist, then there is no "mapped out".

> >In the end, all of it must be accounted for, energetically speaking.

Must it? Even if we translate "emotional energy" into a physical model, and say that energy must be accounted for (which is really just a way of saying that energy is never created or destroyed, standard stuff), there's still no reason to suppose that concepts of "harm" or "benefit" are connected to this. Now, one *might* say something along the lines of: "if you take an action, then that corresponds to a change in the form of energy, be that kinetic or potential, as heat or gravitational, or whatever". But that doesn't really mean anything for us, in terms of "harmful" or "beneficial" actions or outcomes. That sort of thing - moral judgement or interpretation - lies outside of such a framework.

> >If we ARE aware of the energetic balance in our lives, it still shakes out to even money. Either the individual had a net benefit or a net cost to humanity.

So far, though, this idea of "energetic balance" has no link to "goodness" or "badness", or other human conceptions of different types of events or situations.

> >I totally agree with pushing back on these concepts to determine their usefulness, but we can only tally the energetic profit/loss after everything is accounted for.

I'm still not (based just on this description we're digging into) convinced there even *is* such an energetic profit/loss, in the sense of one that matters in terms of good or bad behaviour, and good or bad experiential outcomes. There still seems to be a muddling between the concept of "energy" as used to describe *configurations of matter* with that used to describe *subjective experiences of situations*, which hasn't been overcome. All that aside, though, there is perhaps a more important aspect of this as regards "dimensional jumping", which is:

- Why would *intention* - that is, a *direct update* to the facts of the world - incur any sort of karmic aspect, since it is “before” the sort of energy we’re talking about here?

In other words, since intentional change is *not an action*, surely it is in any case outside of a *personal* causality-based karmic framework, no matter how it is conceived of, and particularly in the case of a "physical" model like we've been discussing?

Instead, intentional change would perhaps be more like the reshaping of the whole landscape simultaneously, via the incorporation of a new fact or pattern. We might have a "karmic debt" in the sense that this pattern

would now be a part of the landscape of ongoing experience until it was reversed, directly or by implication, but that wouldn't be related any notion of "good/bad" or even "physical propagation" type concepts, surely. I'd say that "karma", as the word is commonly used, probably wouldn't be an appropriate term for this.

But then, what type of "karma" would there be for such intentional (rather than physical) change, that would be a meaningful guide when selecting intentions and outcomes? That is, other than as a narrative that never *really* shows itself in actual experience. Is it, as you suggested earlier, perhaps just something that be ignored, since it doesn't actually manifest other than as a sort of story?

[...]

[[OmegaAces:

> >Let's Work Together To Save The World

I'd rather not.

> >And that's why you live in the reality you live in.

Sure. This post doesn't have much to do with the motive of the subreddit though. Notions of "Group Meditation" "Save the World" "We" "Together" etc are all assumptions that dodge the overarching subject matter of direct reality experimentation.

> >An example for the kids.

You're hilarious.

> >You're buttmad

Sigh.]]

[[7kek7: **The struggle is not external, it's internal**]]

Reply to “Suns of Eternity after Two Glasses, possible jump?”

What "higher powers" would these be? More specifically, *where* would they be relative to you, and how *exactly* would they influence your experience? (We shouldn't just take these vague notions for granted without digging into them a little, or else we can end up accumulating stacks of semi-superstitions that are not in fact experienced. Just because you might have an experience "as if" something is true, doesn't mean that that description should be taken as "what is really happening". It's important to keep returning to *what exactly was experienced*, so we don't risk potentially getting distracted by little fluffy stories.)

Okay, but: *why?* Why believe those things? As in, what in your direct experience has led you to believe them? And believe them in preference to other possible descriptions?

This might sound like I'm pushing back against your beliefs, but that's not quite my intention. Part of this subreddit is (meant to be) focused on examining the "nature of experience" and the nature of *descriptions about* experiences. And so, if we were going to talk about "higher powers" or "signs", we'd inevitably dig into why we might think there was something "separate" or "out there" that was doing things, and so on.

And so:

In such an investigation, first we might end up focussing on confirming (or dispelling) our everyday assumption that we are a *person-object* located within a *world-place*. (Where "the world" is described along the lines of being a "stable, simply-shared, spatially-extended 'place' unfolding in 'time'".) That is, checking whether that is an accurate description of our ongoing experience or not. The demo exercises in the sidebar are one way to start playing with that, for instance.

And then, if we move beyond those assumptions, we must then make sure we aren't just swapping one story for another - making the same mistake, in a different way. Even the notion of "dimensions" as *places* is potentially suspect, and so on (since at face value it still characterises us as an object in some sense, when we don't really experience ourselves as that, perhaps).

None of which is to say those descriptions can't be *useful*, but that is different to saying they are fundamentally *actual*. The *experiences* might be actual, but the *descriptions of them* might be best viewed as metaphors or narratives - and this includes "dimensional jumping" itself. (For fun, do maybe check out the little exercise in that link, as a way for us to maybe get past the concepts here.)

Looping back to the idea of a "higher power", then, it is might potentially be viewed as a black box concept to fill in for the fact that only a minor aspect of our present state is seemingly unfolded "into the senses". In other words, the "higher power" idea is a side-effect of the error of conceiving of ourselves as an "object in a place": it is a problem with the *description* rather than an aspect of *actual experience*.

The generalised version of this view is that our ongoing experience appears to be "patterned" in certain ways - that is, our experiences have content "as if" things were true. But are those things *fundamentally* true?

If something can be changed, it cannot be fundamentally true. Sometimes we might have experiences "as if" there are higher powers, other times not, and so on. What is the only unchanging property of our experience? Is it perhaps only the fact of "awareness" itself? What else is definitely always true? Etc.

That is the challenge: to investigate what is true. And that's one reason we'd maybe push back on descriptions of "higher powers" and "signs" or indeed "dimensions" - to see if we can have experiences as if they are *not* true, or *differently* true, as well as apparently true. Again, that doesn't mean we can't find particular descriptions attractive and enjoy them; however, if we are being sincere then it's important to take account of the *nature of descriptions themselves*. You get the idea!

I guess the key idea is that we don't let the content *or context* of our descriptions go unexamined. Or perhaps better to say: it's completely fine to use one description or another, but we choose to *also* recognise the *nature* of those descriptions. (Which are perhaps best considered as a sort of "parallel experience': the experience of "thinking [or feeling] about experiences", which doesn't get *behind* the experience.)

And so, please don't filter yourself when you post, because of course "beliefs" are *themselves* an aspect of experience - and what we're ultimately about here is an exploration of the nature of experience. However, have in mind that "meta" perspective where we are taking one step back from the descriptions we use. Importantly, even though descriptions might not be "true", that doesn't mean they're not *useful*. We may certainly have experiences "as if" they were true, and that is itself of interest: just because our descriptions and beliefs don't *explain* our experiences, doesn't necessarily mean they can't be used to *pattern* our experiences - a reversal of our usual way of thinking about them, and itself a reason to keep an eye on them.

Reply to “Matrix and Dimensional Jumping”

If "you" are a *person-object* inside a matrix (that is, a world-experience fully defined by rules, facts and patterns) then it is a problem. If instead **the matrix is within you**, is a patterning *of* you (where "you" is now the non-object *subject* to all experiences), then it isn't.

In any case, you don't *start* with the idea of a matrix and then view everything in terms of it. Rather, you start with your actual ongoing experience and see what fits with that, what is a useful description is. And actually you can use multiple, even conflicting models if you like - because none of them are "what is really happening behind the scenes". All that is really happening is: *experiencing* (including the experience, at the same level, of "thinking about experience"). Basically, there is no particular reason why "dimensional jumping" should (or should need to) fit in with the idea of a "matrix".

I find "belief" a tricky, fuzzy concept to work with, but certainly: if you intend in terms of something, a worldview, you tend to get the extended pattern of that something by implication, too.

> [Q: There are several tech billionaires (including Elon Musk) who are convinced we are living in a matrix-type "reality" or program and are funding research on how to break us out of it so some brilliant minds are pondering (and researching) the same questions as you are. IMHO we are in fact breaking out of the matrix type programming (or whatever it is) by DJ'ing.]

Hmm. Are those "brilliant minds", though, really? In this particular context, that is. Elon Musk is arguably a brilliant *businessman* - although time will tell on that, too - and an ambitious fellow, but I wouldn't put much faith in him as regards philosophy or the nature of reality and what have you.

Nick Bostrom is the "simulation hypothesis guy" of the moment. However, as with "multiverses", this pretty much amounts to story-making. Even QBism, my favoured formulation along these lines, really can't be tested as such, only used as a perspective through which to view pre-existing observations. It's very easy to fall into the bad habit of the "reification of abstractions" in this area, conflating our ideas with "what's really happening", when what's really happening is that we are fantasising in our thoughts about an "out there" that isn't. All of which is a roundabout way of saying: with things like "dimensional jumping", I think it's best to take things at face value, direct personal experience, and hold back on thinking of it in terms of *any* conceptual framework - be that a matrix, a simulation, or even as our usual assumptions about being a person in an environment of any sort (that is, an object in a "stable, simply-shared, spatially-extended place unfolding in time"). And if we start off looking at things in a using a certain worldview or description, we should at least cast a skeptical eye on what, exactly, a "description actually is, in the first place, perhaps.

> [Q: Without splitting hairs in terms of labels (I still maintain Elon Musk is a brilliant mind as well as businessman - a friend works at SpaceX and said he can talk astrophysics with the Ph.D's) my point is that The Matrix as people think it is is being studied and not just randomly pondered by some of the most successful businesspeople in the US. It isn't just a crazy question for reddit readers. Although I am way into mind science and other experiments, I believe in and am trained in as an engineer the scienctific method. So yes, I give credence to the fact people with billions want to study this beyond personal experiences people share online or in books.]

That's why I linked to Bostrom and Christopher Fuchs so on - but, yes, for sure, it's certainly worth noting that the idea of a simulation-based worldview isn't just a topic that some people talk about on reddit.

However, I do feel it's worth emphasising that in and of itself it doesn't mean much; you have to take responsibility for judging it on a personal level, because that is the *only* way to judge it. Because it is "before" explanations and observations. I feel that the "scientific method" (whatever that is now: it's a bit of a vague abstraction I think, as per Paul Feyerabend; I'm from a scientific background originally) doesn't really apply, with its assumption of a stable external independent substrate of some sort, although the broader category that we might call "structured investigation" certainly does. I'm with George Ellis that that quite *fundamentally* this is basically a *non-scientific* topic; it's a philosophical or metaphysical one. Ultimately, it still doesn't really get much beyond George Berkeley's variant of subjective idealism in his *Three Dialogues*. You can't really get away from the nature of descriptions themselves. People with billions just get to do whatever they want. In and of itself, I'm not sure that makes the "whatever" something to pay more or less attention to. When they are interested in pursuing a topic you find of interest though, it's definitely advantageous to have those people on side...

Anyway, we've brushed past two or three massive topics there, which would be deserving of a much deeper and more thorough discussion, certainly.

[...]

I think that if we keep in mind that thinking frameworks are just that, then it frees us to adopt the most flexible or open-ended metaphors while investigating for ourselves. The "**life as dream**" metaphor fits that bill quite nicely, I'd say!

> [Q: I have created an entire 'theory' if you will about the dream nature of reality, and taken to its final conclusion via analogy, then the you that is you writing does not exist in any 'real' way... it is just the dream avatar or protagonist, it is the dreamt as is everything else in the dream. The dreamer is not subject to the dream but objective to it. If it is OK with you I can share the theory as a separate post one day. I call it a theory for the reason that it is just that... a theory. Another thing is your insistence on the term 'experience' is something that I have pondered for a long time. The Greek term for the infinite is άπειρο (pronounced: apeiro) which literally means 'without experience' and that 'which is everywhere'. It makes PERFECT sense that the INFINITE then becomes FINITE in order to have an experience, because when something is ALL there is nothing outside of it to relate to, and hence have an experience. So the higher infinite self, has this dream, to EXPERIENCE itself. Only 'problem' is that the dreamer protagonist has to figure this out while in the dream. ;)
>
> EDIT: The Ancient Greeks were very specific and intelligent in creating words. The vast majority of Greek words have a specific etymology, which explains the meaning of the word. For instance, the word WILL - βούλιση has to do with the shooting of an arrow. You are either the archer or the target. Taking it back to the dream analogy: you are the target if you are the dreamt (dream protagonist), and the archer if you are the dreamer.]

> > Another thing is your insistence on the term 'experience' is something that I have pondered for a long time.

That's very interesting, about the roots of the Greek term!

The reason I often use the word "experience" is because it emphasises what is happening *directly*, it avoids implying a fictitious cause, and it can be used in a way that suggests that the experiencer *is* the experience - while conveying that this one fact of the matter is always true, regardless of the content of the experience. And so when we say life is like a dream, it's in the sense of saying that they are identical in *nature*, not just (as the comparison is used) to indicate that waking life can be similarly flexible.

> Only 'problem' is that the dreamer protagonist has to figure this out while in the dream. ;)

And, what's more, there is no outside to the dream - so there *is* no "while *not* in the dream". Sneaky!

Basically, although it can't be truly articulated, we're reaching for something along the lines of: "What you truly are is the non-material material whose only inherent property is *being-aware*, and which 'takes on the shape of' experiences on an 'as if' basis, including the experience of apparently *being-a-person-in-a-world*".

All the other stuff about "not being a person" and the various metaphors of "sandcastles" and so on, the conceptual tricks we might use, are really an attempt to draw our attention to that *directly*, as well as indicate the impossibility of thinking *about* that. In other words, part of this is recognising that *there can be no theory of this*, because it is "before" theories, and theories are really examples of further experiences (the experience of "thinking about the theory"; it is not possible to think about what thinking is "made from").

That doesn't mean that creating theories is a waste of time though. While they can't be used to "explain" the nature of experience, they can, like the examples of "active metaphors" in the sidebar, be used to *shape* experience. The ability to do that is *itself* a direct experience of one's nature, and so is a *type* of explanation, in a way. (As is everything else, of course, but deliberately shifting things beyond of one's previous assumptions and patterns draws attention that fact.)

> You are either the archer or the target.

Or **you are *the whole scene*.** You aren't the archer, or the target, or the action. Rather, **you are the entire moment of "An Archer Shooting An Arrow At A Target"**. Upon examination, you discover that when having the experience of being apparently "over here" and the target "over there", in fact both "over here" and "over there" in the experience are made from you! Metaphorically, then, every attempt to take aim at the target of understanding experience, is an example of you shooting yourself in the foot (and every other part of you/everything).

Reply to “The world does not seem like a private dream”

> But I can't deny that this "world" does not feel like a private, subjective dream.

The sense in which it is a private reality or view, though, is not in the sense of it being a *personal* view. That is, it is not *you-as-person* who "owns" the experience, it is *you-as-awareness* who has "taken on the shape of" the experience of apparently *being-a-person-in-a-world*. This world which is patterned, typically, as an apparently "stable, simply-shared, spatially-extended place unfolding in time". The thing we explore is the extent to which that apparent default corresponds to some solid independent thing, as we tend to assume. This can get tricky, though, because we are always investigating in terms of a perspective (a world view, plus a desire or lack thereof).

For example, if you were to intend something from the perspective of a person, then the ongoing experience of a personal viewpoint is implied within your intention, because you have intended in terms of it. This includes intentions which try to wrestle with it, to transform it (since those are also in terms of it; they re-imply the pattern) rather than intentions which detach from it. We have to keep this in mind, then when we are investigating whether you can have experiences "as if" it were a shared world *and/or* "as if" it was a private view. The main possible outcome is that there is nothing actually "behind" your experience (or rather: behind "experiencing"). Experience is patterned *that-which-experiences*; patterned awareness, you might say. So the only fundamental truth is that there is a property of "awareness"; all content is relative. You can't experience that lack of such a thing directly, though; you can only have experiences so varied versus your initial assumptions that it becomes obvious, by deduction or direct intuition, that it must be the case.

And so, we might conclude that there is no persistent "how things are", and...

> My attempt to understand why and how it works is probably making it harder for me to find success in this, so I'm going to try to stop caring about how and why it works.

...there is also no "how things work".

Here, the notion of "patterning" is an attempt to have description which doesn't end up assuming or implying some sort of "mechanism", because apparent "mechanisms" and "how things work" are *themselves* simply patterning of experience. One implication of this is that if you focus on a particular idea of "how things work" - whether you are seeking evidence for it *or* seeking evidence against it *or* simply thinking in terms of it, implicitly - then you tend to get experiences patterned accordingly, to some extent. (Making investigating somewhat difficult.)

And since it is all "you" (as in *you-as-awareness*), you can't really *deliberately* make yourself intend an experience that you don't commit to, don't really think is possible, or don't actually really like the notion of. It's hard to fool yourself into something you don't want, when there is no "outside" of you that you can use to fool.

"People as patterns" is one such unattractive idea, for many. Although it doesn't actually end up as solipsism, people often anticipate that it will, and that's an unattractive idea: that there is only "me". (Even though it is not *that* "me" that we are referring to.) The idea of an unstable, non-"location" world is also pretty unattractive idea for many, also.

To return:

> But I can't deny that this "world" does not feel like a private, subjective dream.

Then it isn't (currently, in your understanding of the concept). It is not ever "really" that anyway, of course, I suggest, but you can have experiences "as if" it were that (corresponding to your notion or description of such a situation). Doing so reveals the more important observation that, fundamentally, "the world" and "you" are not "really" any-*thing*, other than the experiencing of those apparent things. This is always true, and your descriptions and concepts *about* the world and you are "parallel constructions in thought".

Although - it would be good to ponder what it would "feel like", in your view, if it were a private, subjective dream. Are you anticipating that a simple wish would bend the world accordingly and instantly? What would be the signs of a private, subjective dream, for you? Because it might be that you are really thinking about something else, here. That is, a private, subjective dream where there is no stability - basically just a dim and transitory thought - rather than a stable one, that is like a bright and persistent thought.

Have you ever had a lucid dream where characters seem independent, have their own will?

> This is a catch 22.

Somewhat, it may seem. However, it *is* possible to commit to something without regard to belief or disbelieve, liking or disliking. So it's about no longer indulging in thinking about possibilities or lack of possibilities, wheher something makes sense or not, is appropriate or not. Instead, it's about treating it - as we might say - as a "dumb patterning system". In a dumb patterning system, holding a pattern in mind - we might saying "thinking it" or "intending it" or "imagining-that it is true" or "thinking the fact that something is true" or "shifting state", although there's really no way to describe it - intensifies its relative contribution while, simply because there is only "one thing", intensifying its extended logical pattern while diminishing anything contradictory to it. It doesn't matter whether you "believe" in it or your view of it in moral or potential terms, therefore, so long as you don't spend a lot of time holding a contradictory pattern in mind (during the intention, or subsequently). An example of this would be, not so much believing, but resisting the urge to indulge in "doubting", in the form of imagining-that something contradictory to the outcome, or fact, is true. (Which is a sort of *faith*, really, I suppose; or a willingness to allow. Mentioned again below.)

This does lead to something else important, though. That is, that the exact pattern that you are holding, its form or content, does make a difference. You might say to me that, for instance, you have been "intending to win the competition" - but the thing you are actually doing may in fact not really be that, not in the sense meant above. The structuring you are using needs to correspond to the structuring of your conception of experience, in some way, in terms of *meaning*. Just simply summoning a picture of you on a winning podium for example, probably won't do much, probably bringing about some coincidences in the same way that the owl exercise brings about the extended pattern of "owls" in a sort of general overlay.

> [private, subjective dream] But I do think reality would be a lot more responsive to my intentions, and nothing would be outside of my control.

I suggest that a private, subjective dream does not have *any* specific inherent properties, because *any* content could fit into that description (including that of apparently being in a physical shared world). There is no difference in *nature* between a flexible lucid dream and everyday life; what's different is the level of inertia, the depth of the patterning (metaphorically speaking). However, that "depth" or "inertia" *is itself* patterning of experience, and one can experiment with it.

But it does take some commitment, which isn't necessarily easy to come by when the world seems "so obviously" a stable and external place (except when it suddenly isn't for a moment). I guess that's why people talk about needing "faith", since there often isn't any sensory experience corresponding to an outcome - until there is. (It's also why this subreddit, for example, uses the perspective of this being an "investigation", where nobody else's ideas, including mine, should be taken on trust.)

> [lucid dream characters] as soon as I became lucid... and they were no longer autonomous as they were when I wasn't lucid, so it ruined the fun.

Well, there is something of a lesson in there, perhaps. It *is* however possible to create (or should I say, summon the patterns into experience of) autonomous populated worlds: "persistent realms" standard link, and so on. Basically the same as this current experience. As I mentioned before, though, it's important to note that the dream comparison/observation isn't saying that "you are the only real person and it's all under your control". Rather, it's that *you aren't real either*. (Where by "real" I mean independent and external to direct experience, separate and solid and "out there".)

The only thing that is "real" - which is to say, unchanging and therefore always *true* - is the fact of the property of *being-aware*, or "awareness". This is something you could conclude from noticing the content of everyday mundane experience, of course.

> I can't tell if I ever actually successfully intended something.

You can sort of "know" you are intending, but unless the result of the intention overlaps with the sensory aspect of the current moment, then there's no "experience" of intending as such. There is no "doing" involved; it's a sort of "shapeshifting" or "becoming". This is true even of things like deliberately moving your arm: you intend the fact that your arm is going to move, a short time later the experience of your arm moving is encountered in the senses. As an exercise: move your arm, and try to find yourself "doing" it, find the "cause". (If you then ascribe it to you having a thought of "lift my arm", then take a step back and try to find the cause of that thought. And so on.)

Aside - To reemphasise, here, "intending" means "to increase the contribution of a fact or pattern to ongoing experience" and "the intention" is "the fact or pattern whose contribution is to be increased". (And the pattern or fact already exists, eternally.) There really isn't any good way to describe it in words, to be honest. It just *is*. Language tends to divide things into a "thing", a "thing doing" and a "thing done". Here, though, they are all the same. This problem also arises when trying to describe the nature of "you" (you are *that-which-experiences* and the content of the experience and its context).

Reply to “What is stopping us form jumping?”

Either/or.

- If you absolutely totally let go, then your immediate sensations will relax into the background some what, and you then allow your experience to shift - intentions will take effect. (This is true of daily life: if you completely give up and stop *trying*, then ironically things become much easier. It's an extreme version of that.)
- If you're not willing to let go and have things recede into the background, you can instead intensely focus on something (for distraction, or for a desire) and have the present moment experience fall away as a result of that.

I think the first approach is better over the long term, and makes the second one easier eventually anyway. But it takes a bit of courage to totally let go; at least with intense focus you think you've got a secure grip.

A good comparison is visualisation. If you try to summon a picture through intense concentration, you can do it, but it takes effort and it's never very vivid. On the other hand, if you just fall back, open up and "let it come to you" the image you get is much more vivid and reliable and doesn't need to be forcibly maintained.

Absolute letting go, ideally, means you release everything expect your *perspective*. This means the world around you, your body, thoughts - everything except the conscious space in which your experiences appear. The intensity is what you're after, without making it happen. But if you don't like using the mirror, you can try lying down on the ground - and switch your perspective to "being the space around you and through you". The difficulty here is that, inherently, letting go (and thereby having senses-perceptions fade into the background) like this means all the parts of experience you are avoiding will become more prominent. I think this is the origin of people being afraid of the dark.

Reply to “Could someone explain what detachment is?”

One potential definition:

- To "detach" is to cease holding onto your current experience - letting body, mind, *and attention* move as it wants - so that the content of your conscious perspective can shift freely with intention.

If you check the main sticky, you can see the links to the *Overwriting Yourself* and *Just Decide* posts. You'll find those are great for general improvement. Do the "passive" version of the exercise every day.

So, detachment means not holding onto any part of experience. Then when you *intend* - which requires no act, one simply does so - whatever appears is fine. Remember that intention is different from attention. You can't focus intention; you can only persist in it.

If a phrase is repeating in your head as a side-effect, that's fine, it's just a related result. The same phrase repeated without intention wouldn't do anything, of course, but as part of an intention, all good. The act never matters except that it helps you specify what you want, perhaps. (Some people find "will" a better word than "intention", for this reason. It seems less associated with the idea of doing something physical.)

Further thoughts on intention

(Perhaps a little bit abstract so feel free to ignore.)

You might think of intention as the *recalling or summoning* of an experiential pattern you want to arise - overlaying it upon your world-pattern so that you encounter it later. You create the change *now* so that it's there for you to experience when you get to it *later*. That's why you can't actually feel yourself intending, you only experience the *result* when you encounter it and it seems to "happen". Also, because there's no such thing as intending in general terms, only specifically, there is no "act" of intention. It's not something you do *to* your world, it's a shifting of yourself *as* your world.

If you intend to move your arm, the intention *is* the summoning of the "arm-movement pattern" into your world; a moment later, your attention encounters the pattern you have created in the future, and you experience your arm moving.

If you intend to meet a friend tomorrow, the intention *is* the creation of that pattern right now. It becomes true *now* that you will meet your friend *tomorrow. However, you won't experience it until, later, your attention reaches "tomorrow".

Hey, here we go. First I'll just say, that it might be that striving for results is getting in your way. Genuinely the way to think of this is that you are "inserting a new fact" into your world ("it is now true that my body is going to get up soon") and then waiting until you encounter that fact. I appreciate this can be tricky to grasp and execute - it's the whole *non-doing* thing that has befuddled many people for a long time, including myself!

But anyway:

1. With the *Just Decide* exercise, you don't really need to visualise anything. Visualisation provides detail for your intention, it isn't actually your intention. Simply decide *that your body is going to get up*. And then just continue to play dead, not do anything. The getting-up was already been created in the future (as it were); simply wait and allow yourself to be moved when the time comes.

There is zero effort in the intending or in the waiting or in the movement. View it with the attitude that "my work is done now" and there's nothing more to be done.

It can take a while before your first experience, and you may even find you accidentally "reassert" your lying position in the act of paying attention.

A trick to get around this: rest/centre your attention a couple of inches back from your eyes, "withdraw your presence" from your body space so that you can't trigger old patterns. (Ideally you'd actually detach and "become the background space", but they amount to the same thing. The head gap *is* the background space.)

2. This is a good point, and it varies from person to person. My legs stay there quite happily, resting against one another. Some people slightly angle their legs so that their knees self-support. Others actually use a belt or material to tie their knees together. (Remember, the constructive rest is about being fully supported; but having your knees tied together obviously makes getting up tricky eh.)
3. Having your feet elevated works fine too. The complexity of the movement required to get up doesn't actually matter. (See below.)

To summarise: for the *Just Decide* exercise itself, it doesn't necessarily matter exactly what your position is, it's about being detached. And for constructive rest, it's about what feels more supported for your own body structure. Perhaps you'd benefit from splitting this into two things:

- Doing the constructive test position daily for your ongoing releasing of patterns.
- Doing specific *Just Decide* in whatever form you feel best.

Another version of the exercise is to practice catching:

Catching Up

So, get in a room with a friend and have them throw (for instance) pens at you. Pens are nice, awkward shapes which you cannot "work out" how to catch. Stand opposite one another, and centre/rest your attention in that position behind your eyes so that you withdraw your presence from your body. You have already intended to catch the pen so there's nothing you need to "do" to catch it; provided you don't interfere, you will simply respond in the most efficient way.

You will be surprised at the complexity of the movements this summons from you.

> I will adhere to your advice and post a result when there is one but I won't try to force it.

It's really difficult to describe in language, actually, so it's understandable that it takes a while to suss it out. That's why bodywork approaches like Alexander Technique have one-on-one "lessons", so you can do it as a sort of physical dialogue.

"Do or do not, there is not try." But then it's also "oh, but don't *do* anything, just *decide and allow*". But don't really "decide just *intend*". And by the way, you can't really muscularly feel yourself "intend" it's a sort of *felt-sense* shift. And "allowing" really means "cease opposing", so you can't do that either. (In other words, don't worry about it.)

It's actually much simpler in action (so to speak) than it is to describe. It's like trying to describe how you shift your attention, say. It just... happens. You "change your perceptual shape" somehow.

When the Buddhists talk of *non*-attachment (really the better word in this case), it's that thing of being okay with whatever happens. By being *non*-attached you aren't driven to tinker and interfere and thereby mess up what you've already done by *deciding*.

> The Catching Up one looks pretty fun to do. Now I need to find a friend that would actually be interested in doing this.

Yeah, it's... bizarre. You could always get an *enemy* to do it, of course - they'd be more motivated to throw things at you, and maybe raise the stakes in terms of the preferred projectile. ;-)

Reply to “So can i jump without the whole "candle n mirror @ night"?”

The point is to get yourself into a detached state, released from holding onto the current sensory experience. Check out the other methods post linked on the sidebar - e.g. Neville Goddard approach of entering deep relaxation, etc.

You don't even need the timing, although there's something about the quietness of late night, and it feels "special" in a way that helps. The trick to letting go is to let go of your *attention*. People understand letting go of the body and thought, but they leave their attention narrowed. Free your attention also. Then, once you've settled out, you can begin, focusing your will.

Here's a good exercise to begin doing:

Daily Releasing Exercise

- Twice a day, 10 minutes, lie down in the constructive rest position. On the floor, feet flat, knees up, head supported by a couple of books, hands resting on your lower torso.



- Completely let go to gravity. Give up totally, play dead.
- If your body moves or thoughts come up, let them be. Just let them release without interference.
- If you find your attention becomes focused on something, the same: just let go of your attention. Give up, again.
- At the end of the session (don't worry about exact timing), decide to get up, but don't make any movement. Wait until your body moves by itself. This won't happen for a while, but during one session, it will.
- In general, resist the urge to interfere with your body and mind, to push it along. Settle back and let it run at its own pace.

Reply to “So, this stuff is for real, right? If so, here's what I want to do”

Time travel, eh?

Time & Trajectories

The whole Infinite Grid metaphor came from seeing time as a parallel-simultaneous set of "moments". In *theory* you could switch to any 1st-person experience. In *practice* you-as-consciousness could already be doing this, perhaps, but with no memory between "perspectives". So what you are really asking is: Can I switch to another experience while retaining my memories so far?

Well, small jumps seem to play out in that way. Situations change, buildings move, people's dogs change colour, that author never wrote that book - but everyone tells you it was always that way, in contrary to your own trajectory memory. However, it does seem that there's a tendency to *want-to-forget* about shifts in experience, as commonly reported in /r/Glitch_in_the_Matrix. I find this true even with "minor oddness". Perhaps because the memory doesn't really connect up properly to other accumulated memory patterns.

Meanwhile: Ignore ideas of "impact on the world" and changing timelines. This is not time travel in that sense. In fact, no individual moment is inherently connected to another individual moment. *You* are the connection between moments, your trajectory.

Resets & Relaxation

User /u/Memory_Echoes wrote something a while back about life-resets which you might find interesting. You can see his post here.

> [**‘A Multi-Life Experiment’ by Memory_Echoes**
>
> Hey GitM. I'm going to start making a post here at least once a week or 2, and maybe a short story here and there. I think I'll start with a multi life reset experiment I've done regarding a car accident. I'll probably talk about the failures next time. I'll introduce concepts as I go to best understand what I'm talking about. Please bare with me, I'm not the best at telling stories. I did my best to break this up to make is a readable as possible.
>
> To understand the following, I need to explain the concept of a memory echo, a public scene, and a private scene.
>
> To someone who doesn't understand the concept, a memory echo is the feeling of intense deja vu crossed with an amnesiac suddenly recalling a memory. As with an amnesiac, the memory can also trigger other memories, usually related. The memory echo supercedes the concepts of time and space. To access a memory echo, a trigger event must occur. A trigger event is usually an event where an intense emotion is experienced and can be anything from a specific event to a form of media (for instance, reading my post).
>
> The public scene is the concept that when in public, there is very little you can physically change. If you try to change things that take place in the public scene, the world adjusts to bring it back on track.

A private scene is the concept that when alone or with a smaller group of people (or on a phone), you can pretty much do whatever you want. The private scene can actually take place inside of a public scene as long as it does not attempt to change the public scene.

The first life this experiment starts is when I crash my car on my way to work on a snowy day in February. The memory of me in tears (an intense emotion) is something I can never forget (a memory echo). That life proceeds until I hit my failure moment (will talk about this another time, its unimportant to the story), and reset.

The next life I remembered it happening the same morning it had happened the first life, I brushed it off as deja vu, and went to work. The crash happened again. Again tears. Again the life continues until a failure point and resets. The third life, I now have the memory of it happening, and the memory of the supposed deja vu. This time I take a different route and get to work fine. Little did I know it wasn't the end of this story. A rainy day in March, once again, I crash rounding the same bend, complete loss of control of the vehicle. Again tears, will this ever end? Im extremely confused, no idea what is going on. This isn't regular deja vu. It's like I'm meant to crash. Continue life until a failure in May after moving for the first time. Next life, the intensity of what I think is deja vu is more overwhelming than I've ever felt before. I get the memory of the crashes a full week before a supposed snow storm. Still not sure what's going on, I decide it might be some kind of a premonition and avoid that path altogether. Things get a bit wacky here. Hit the day in March, the path I've been taking is closed for road work. How does this make sense? It's raining. None of that was there the day before. Turn around to the other path. Crash on that blind turn again, complete loss of control. It's like the world adjusted to make sure it happened. Decide to burn that thought into my memory while in tears. Move again, get a new job this time. Still hit a failure point. Concept of public scene is developed in this life.

It works. In the next life I remember the sadness, but most of all the anger. The intense anger at the world for changing. Is there anything I can do to change it? I'm not sure. The snowy day again. This time i get a phone call. It's my boss telling me not to come in. Salvation? I sure thought so. I brush off the memories and continue my life. I then once again meet what appears to be fate in March once more. Spin out, hit a pole. Why me? I just want to live my life. I have a better understanding at this point and begin to develop the concept of the private scene. I move again, and get a different job from the one above. Continue to failure point and reset.

My life. This one is me. I remember all of the above, and so, so much more. The ultimate test this time around. Can I get to May 27th, the day I move, without crashing? I expect the phone call in February, but it never comes, I decide to go in late instead of on time. The road with the turn is now blocked. Go another route. No crash. I find a third route I hadn't known about previously. March comes quickly. It's already the fateful rainy day. I decide to try this new third route. No crash happens. May 27th here I come. I thought I was finally free. I was wrong. On my way to my new home, I'm 15 minutes from my destination. I think you can guess what happens. While not as bad as the previous crashes, the entire left side of the vehicle has been damaged beyond repair from the guard rail. There appears to be no escape.

This is an ongoing experiment. To my knowledge, the crash must happen on or before May 27th, and no earlier than February.]

Reminds me of Ken Grimwood's excellent book, *Replay*.

Anyway, you'll only know by experimenting. But I'll give you a general tip for all this stuff: Do not try. The important thing for making any change (whether it's just to be more relaxed in daily life, or change your reality) is to detach and allow, and so be effortless. If you feel yourself making any effort to do something, you are doing it wrong.

When I was a kid, I used to practice picturing things by imagining the Millennium Falcon rotating. If I put any effort into it, it would fade. You have to *decide* it and *be with* it, while letting it happen, not making it happen. Sort of "ask and receive". As a general life thing, practicing this is a good idea.

Extra thought: We have all these ideas in fiction about parallel universes, simulated environment, time travel, etc. Where do those ideas come from?

Additional

It can also be helpful to view time as the simplified Hall of Records model, meaning that you are connecting to and exploring immersive memory-experiences. All lives have already happened in all possible ways; you're just browsing the recordings. This solves any time-based dilemmas you might have and is easier to imagine than the Infinite Grid.

As others have said, there is much to consider about the whole "going back" thing. Wouldn't it be better to have tomorrow be *as if* things were great instead? The memories you have are patterns which exist only in your personal perspective, but they *do* influence your next-moment, so why not release them? But that's all up to you, it's not for me to tell you what you want or should want.

[...]

He probably has other accounts, maybe doesn't check that one much. If you go with his info, it's that he feels he has parallel memories - not a technique, other than reaching emergency states.

To be honest, I would carve your own path anyway. *Make a decision*, then focus on it. Regardless of result, the process will educate. If you look at the books linked in the Neville Goddard post, the process for accessing immersive 3D past is there, for lucid memory access: Relax, effortless imagery, allow, via detached intention. Which is all the present moment really is: an accessed 3D memory... As always, the trick is in the commitment to the target ideal; detaching emotionally from the previous one.

Reply to “I'm so confused”

> I read that it's [dimensional jumping] some type of metaphor. So if you dimension jump from 'poor' to 'wealthy' would that just change your state of mind to work harder to get wealthy? Or would your whole reality change and you will automatically be getting more money?

It's a metaphor in the sense that it's a particular concept for describing an experience. That is, you might have experiences so discontinuous that they are "as if" you have "jumped dimensions". In that case, the *experience* is literally true, but the *description* is a metaphor - since you don't actually experience "dimensions" as such. It's just that the experience is *consistent with* such a concept; other descriptions could equally apply to those experiences too. In other words, descriptions are never "what is really happening". They are, in a way, also experiences: the experience of "thinking about experiences".

Anyway, the ultimate point is that the *direct experience is primary*; descriptions do not "cause" experiences and are not "how they work"; descriptions are secondary. However, it might be observed that intending something *in terms of* a particular description might "pattern" your experience to be consistent with that description. (This is still not the same as the description being "true", however.) This can only be explored through personal experimentation, though, so you must begin by doing the exercises in the sidebar, and see what experiences you have. At this moment now, you might say that you are having an experience *consistent with* or "as if" you are a *person-object* located within a *world-place*. And you generally think of that "world" as being a "stable, simply-shared, spatially-extended 'place' unfolding in 'time'". But also you might say that this is not actually what is *happening*.

What is *happening* - you might consider - is that *you-as-experiencer* has "taken on the shape of" the experience of *apparently* being a person in a world - that *you-as-awareness* has taken on the shape of a 3-dimensional, multi-sensory "moment". The description of what that moment is and its content, that is in *parallel* or *simultaneous with* that sensory moment: it doesn't get *behind* it. And so, again, the *description* is a metaphor, but the *experience* is literal. The description is a metaphor because it is a conceptual construction, as a parallel experience, which tries to replicate certain elements of the experience to make it thinkable, but that doesn't mean the description points to just a "state of mind" (in the way you mean it anyway). Part of the fun of the experiment is to explore how valid your everyday descriptions are, in the face of the direct experiences you can generate!

This includes your descriptive ideas of "your own perception", "other people" and even the broader concept of "reality". You may find that all of those terms have hidden assumptions which will need to be unpacked, as you progress. For example, you might consider in what way "other people's reality" is actually experienced by you. And, in fact, to what extent you truly experience "a reality", given that this concept sort of implies a "place" that is somehow external to you. Do you experience something external to you? If you think so, then in what way exactly? And so on.

Meanwhile, perhaps try out this little exercise for fun, to give a sense of what a shift in perspective would be like on this:

Feeling Out Exercise

... a little exercise can help give us a direct experience of what it means to be the subject to all experience, to recognise that we are not an object and that we are "unlocated". We might close our eyes and try to:

a) find the "edges" of your current experience.
b) find where "you" are in your current experience. *and:*
c) investigate what your current is experience is "made from". *finally:*
d) think about yourself, and then note the location of that thought and what it is "made from".

The conclusions of this are the *direct facts* of your experience - the only actual facts, really; everything else is transitory. Whatever you *think about* your experience is also another experience within this context. You can never get "behind" or "outside" of this, because it has not edges or boundaries; there *is* no behind or outside. (If you think otherwise, then pause and notice that your thought about this is *also* "within" and "inside".)

[...]

So, the possibility of control is a secondary thing, really. That is, that noticing that the entire moment of experience is "made from" you, is *within and as* you, is the primary thing, the basic aspect of your experience. It is the only fundamental property of it: the property of *being-aware* or "awareness", the context to all experiential content. This noticing can be direct (look and see that it is so) or can be approached indirectly (by participating in exercises and finding that your standard description, involving a "you" and "world" separation, is inaccurate, and following where that leads).

Now, this fact suggests that your experience is better thought of as "patterned awareness", because it is the case that there are no inherent parts to *you-as-awareness*, no inside or outside and so on. This is true regardless of whether you can effect change or not. Even if your current main strand of experience just continued "on rails" and could not by adjusted, it would still be true that it was not external to you. It's not "beyond your fingertips" because you don't *have* fingertips, you merely "taken on the shape of" the *experience of apparently* having fingertips and there being things beyond those fingertips.

However, it is worth noting that the "you" we are talking about here is not the *personal* you. Following from the above, the *personal* you is actually a formatting of experience. You are not a person, you are *that which takes on the shape of* an ongoing moment of experience which is formatted "as if" you were a person. Right now, *you-as-awareness* have "taken on the shape of" this 3D multi-sensory moment of apparently being "over here" and the room being "over there", but quickly you can perceive that it is all "you". So, when you move your arm, you are not a person moving an arm - rather, you are patterning *you-as-awareness* wth the fact of "my arm is lifting" and subsequently that is unfolding as a sensory experience, with the entire sensory moment being "you".

This leads to difficulty discussing "causing change", of course. Because you don't really *cause* change, so much as "become" a new state or pattern which consists of the desired experience as an aspect of it or implied fact within it. And there's no "outside" to you - no separation between you and result, no "doer" and "done to" - so you (as patterned awareness) either have changed, or you have not. (Note that this "state" isn't describing just

the sensory moment, it's the entire set of facts within that moment, which imply all subsequent moments - until you shift state again.)

You can't *try* to change state, for instance, because that would just be patterning yourself with the experience of "trying". This *might* be taken as a suggestion that, if you don't experience the outcome that you wanted to experience, then you did not in fact intend for the outcome, but instead intended for something else. You might have *thought* that you were intending for your outcome, but further investigation will show that you did not.

A mundane example: you want to improve your posture, but instead of actually intending to "have relaxed ideal posture" you instead in fact intend to "tense my neck upwards and push my shoulders back" because that is your conception of what "good posture" was. Another: you are in an arm-wrestle, but instead of intending to "have my arm be over there in the winning position" you in fact intend "to tense my muscles and thus generate a feeling of power and effort", which actually *opposes* the movement towards the winning position.

So, getting to the conclusion at last: one way to think of apparently lack of ability to control is that you are tending towards intending or re-implying your misconception of the world - intending your *inaccurate description* of experience - rather than actually intending the outcome. Which is why there are no "methods" or "mechanisms" to suggest for this, and it's ultimately actually all about exploring and unpacking one's own patterning?

> >But, you're actually changing a situation in your own reality right?

It's a bit of a tautology, that. If you are changing your own ongoing experience, then you are changing "your own situation in your reality" - because what is a "situation" or "reality" or "experience" anyway? They are the same thing. It is only the use of particular concepts that introduces the idea of a separation between those things. You never actually experience a separation as such.

As for whether you are "actually" switching dimensions, the thing to consider is: how would you differentiate between having an experience "as if" you switched dimensions (that is, an experience *consistent with a description using the concept of* "dimensions") and an experience of "actually" switching dimensions?

This is why the subreddit ends up being an exploration of both the "nature of experiencing" and also the nature of *descriptions about* experiencing. We take a step back from it all, and consider what we truly mean by these things. To an extent, the name "dimensional jumping" is somewhat of a provocation. It asserts the idea of "dimensional jumping" and challenges you to have experiences consistent with that idea. If you then *do* have experiences consistent with that idea, does it mean you "actually" jumped dimensions? Or does it mean something else, something more fundamental? Does it perhaps imply something about your everyday notions about what "you" are, what "the world" is, and the relationship between the two (and *if* there is two)?

[...]

The short answer is: there *are* no answers, other than just doing it (in the spirit of exploration and experimentation).

Yep, just do the demo exercises in the sidebar, and take it from there. Think of any descriptions about "what this is" as just being *useful ways to talk about it*, rather than accurate explanations of "what is really happening". What is really happening is: *the experience*. Everything else is just communication. Again, treat it like an experiment you are conducting, aimed at confirming (or not) your everyday assumptions about yourself and your experiences!

Reply to “Would anyone be willing to talk about their dimension jumping experience(s) on a radio show?”

A good starting point before agreeing to an interview about this, is to ask the potential interviewer:

- "What is your understanding of 'dimensional jumping' at the moment?"

Based on that answer, you can tell whether you are in good hands or not. In other words, whether it's a "check out this crazy shit" type of a deal, or if it's going to be a more considered, philosophical exchange which has had a bit of thought put into it.

Not that everyone needs to have read George Berkeley's *Three Dialogues* or Immanuel Kant's musings in order to have a good discussion, but it's probably a waste of time having a conversation about this unless there is *some* prior background or interest in pondering "the nature and formatting of experiencing" - because without a proper context all this stuff seems apparently nonsensical.

But, y'know, it's for everyone to decide for themselves whether this would be an appropriate channel for all your dimensional jumping conversational needs; it might still be fun maybe possibly.

[...]

Just to interject quickly:

> > I suppose any opposition to the approaches discussed on this subreddit would be a key talking point, but obviously this would depend on the answer to my first question.

To my mind, this is immediately an error (in this context). To anticipate building a show around opposing viewpoints - basically, to construct a controversy - prior to there *being* any viewpoints, surely highlights that this is the wrong approach here? "We'll find out what these guys think and then find someone who thinks the opposite."

It's a well-worn and uninspiring format, I tend to think, when the topic is one that needs background, rather than being an argument about a social issue or whatever. I generally much prefer shows and podcasts which are more collaborative and therefore informative - "We've got these people on, let's find out all about their topic and their view of the world, being sure to pick up on anything which seems unclear or incoherent".

This is particularly true of subjects like this one, which isn't really about holding a belief or opinion. Primarily, it's about investigating your experience without completely aligning to any particular view. So there is no position to defend, necessarily, as such.

However, it would be interesting to get a selection of people on who have different angles on the central concept - the nature of reality and how to explore it and conceive of it - as opposed to, um, trying to select opposing viewpoints without having an advance understanding of those viewpoints.

Anyway, here are a few underlying ideas off the top of my head (others might disagree):

- Our descriptions of the world are not the *world-as-it-is*. They are parallel constructions in thought.

- The experiences you have dictate the descriptions which are valid or possible, but the descriptions you adopt do not dictate the experiences which are valid or possible. *(However there may be an exception to this.)*
- There is a distinction to be made between *fundamental* truth (the nature or context of experience) and *relative* truth (the content of experience).
- By performing experiments we can differentiate between these categories, and apply the results in useful ways.

So basically: investigating the nature of your personal experience, and as a byproduct perhaps generating useful results in addition to information. Which aspect of that people are attracted to more, is up to them.

A "dimension" in this context, is the current state that you are in (at least, according to one of a number of different metaphorical descriptions of the nature of experience). However, this doesn't mean that you are a person in a world that is in a particular state; it means that *you-as-experiencer* are in a particular state, which is prior to your actual sensory experiences of *being-a-person-in-a-world*.

Yeah, I know. So it's probably worth reading the sidebar and the stuff linked from there, and actually playing with this a bit, I would say. I mean, you can just play around with the demo exercises and see what happens instead, but those are just the starting point for exploration and contemplation really.

> I appreciate your preference in media and share a similar enjoyment for informative content but feel that just because a forum contains two differing viewpoints it does not mean it can't offer the listener an opportunity to learn.

My point was more that you were looking to set up a *for-against* dynamic for your show, without really knowing what the "for" would be! How are you going to have two differing viewpoints, when the topic isn't viewpoint- or belief-based as such? Of course, it could be reframed in the sense of "who's the most useful philosopher?" or "is *such-and-such* possible?", but my gut feeling is that it doesn't apply. Note that it wasn't really a criticism or concern as such, more a personal perspective on what I think works better with certain topics. (I tend to think that the now-default adoption of the "report the controversy" or "set up an objective frame" approaches, independent of the nature of the topic, has rendered a lot of topic-based mainstream journalism and interviews largely worthless.)

So - not a direct criticism of your take, I hope you realise.

> Perhaps the uninitiated person might disagree with your viewpoints which would result in a compelling discussion.

Certainly that's a more promising starting point. How to pitch it though? Since the focus is on attending to your personal experience as it is, and trying something out and judging the results for yourself, the underlying viewpoint is sort of a "meta-viewpoint". In effect, the attitude is that there is no fundamental "how things work". I suppose that in itself is something that can be discussed. But even that is no more than a potentially useful viewpoint; it is not claimed to be "true". (You might just end up with people arguing that they experienced something *vs* they didn't experience something.)

> So essentially (and please correct my mistakes) 'dimensional jumping' is a mindset that assists you in viewing the world in a less 'traditional' sense and therefore brings you closer to attaining your goals. Would that be fair to say?

I would rephrase it perhaps: that "dimensional jumping" is a mindset whereby you do not take for granted that the 'traditional' or common description of the world is true - although one does not have to reject it either - and are thus free to examine approaches and descriptions on usefulness alone. Something like that.

> Perhaps I'm taking posts too literally but when users such as this talk about aspects of their life changing after 'jumping' are they speaking metaphorically or are they suggesting they 'jumped' and they now exist in another 'dimension'?

It's captured in the sidebar really. There's the exercises, and there's the general notion of using metaphors to conceive of and to describe change.

So a "dimension" is a metaphor, but only in the sense that "the world" or "youtalktv" is a metaphor. We *infer* our current situation in terms of concepts, based on our experiences. If something dramatic changed in your experience, something which was akin to an underlying *fact-of-the-world* changing without your direct intervention, you might conceptualise that as being "as if" you had changed worlds or jumped dimensions.

In other words, it's a *descriptive framework*. What actually "happened" is: you were experiencing "this" and then you experienced "that". Everything else is metaphor and narrative. That applies not just to this example, though; everything that isn't direct sensory experience is in effect a connective fiction to some extent. Leading to...

The real question is: what is the relationship between our connective fictions and *how-things-are-really* (even though that is itself a concept)?

Having said all that - for sure, most people just try out the exercises and, perhaps, find that they get results. If they get results, and they are interested in investigating further, they *might* try repeating this and more ambitiously, to confirm there is something to it rather than mere coincidence - and perhaps contemplate what that means. Regardless, the description of "what happened" will be secondary to the experience, and is not "what really happened".

[...]

"Are the experiences literal?"

> I think my key question is, putting all mindset approaches other than the physical techniques listed, are the experiences accounted in this subreddit literal?

The experiences themselves are literal, as in the person had the experience of those events happening. But any account in terms of a "state" or a "dimension" is just part of a conceptual framework, a descriptive narrative. This is fundamental:

- *The content of the experience is primary; the narrative is secondary.*

The narrative provides a way of thinking about the experience, and perhaps acts as a source of creative inspiration too for possible approaches - but it is not "what really happened". But that's not new, of course.

This is, not quite, in much the same way as "gravity" does not cause things to fall down - rather, "gravity" is the name of a description *about* things falling down (loosely speaking). Similarly, "the subconscious" is not *really* the source of mental events, it is a concept we use to form a connective narrative *about* mental events. And so on.

The difference here (with the topic of this subreddit), is that the number of "observational touch-points" associated with descriptions of these experiences description is vastly reduced, since we are dealing with one-off events often, and the experience is a certain subset of the subjective rather than being pseudo-objective.

Experiences, Results & Explorations

> For example, the use of the numbered hex headers is to confirm that a user has indeed altered their worldly 'state' to one where identifiable aspects differ to the 'state' they were 'in' previously?

Well, not really. The number is a bit of fun. For sure, if someone had the experience of the number changing then they'd definitely know something was up! But as the sidebar says, it's an "emblem of change" and potential.

> This is a very interesting point. So you would argue that the majority of users find the practice of these methods more attractive than the end result?

In my personal view, the purpose of playing with this is to widen one's thinking about the nature of the world, and so on. If you get a result that seems, well, *unlikely*, then hopefully that might trigger a bit of thought as to *how, exactly* that result came about. Of course, that's down to the person themselves. They could quite equally just do it for a result. However, the framing of the subreddit is very much of this being an *exploration* rather than a set of techniques or a singular worldview.

'Beliefs' & Analogies

> I like the sandcastle analogy and strongly agree that it would be necessary to provide a foundation of these 'beliefs' before delving into a person's experiences.

I think that's key, definitely. Although again, I'd emphasise that the only "belief" would be one that arose from having had personal experiences - i.e. the belief would be that there was something interesting going on. Otherwise (another analogy incoming) it would be like having two people have a discussion about "the nature of the night sky", one of whom had spent their evenings looking through one of those new-fangled telescopes, and one who hadn't. You can discuss the meaning of observations, for sure, but only if you have actually made the observations - looked through the telescope.

To mix it up further: it's always fun to discuss a carefully-drawn map, but there's not much point in discussion the accuracy of maps if you haven't done some walking in the area depicted - or worse, if one person is referring to an shipping map while another is referring to a flight map.

He Said, She Said & Beyond Common Sense

> Unfortunately the discussion would almost certainly fall into some sense of "he said/she said" simply due to the nature of said experience.

Which could be a bit pointless, potentially, because nobody is suggesting here that a particular set of facts are true - there is no position to defend. As the sidebar emphasises, it's about trying out a couple of things and

seeing what the results are, to see if there is "anything going on". There is no belief system being advocated; merely useful or interesting ways to think about experience.

> As you say, it'd be important not to get bogged down with this and certainly to take each instance on face value and analyse it with a fair and common-sense approach...

The stumbling block is that face value and common-sense might themselves be a problem, I suppose. There is no independently-existing "face value" or "common-sense" that is separate from an implied philosophical stance, and it is not always possible to translate something from one to the other. Sometimes you need to build from the foundation up, and make an independent self-consistent "sandcastle", albeit on the same beach and still made from sand.

To expand: Really, this is just about pushing against our assumptions about the world and ourselves, to see if they are accurate. More than that, it's about pushing against our background assumption that our usual *thoughts-about* the world - or indeed *any* such thinking - is equivalent to *the-world-as-it-is*. How much of the stability and structure of my ongoing experience is due to "the world" and how much due to "my mind"?

So. We do some exercises to explore these assumptions, by perhaps blindly trying to do obtain some results that would not logically follow from our habitual narrative, and we play with constructing alternative coherent narratives and seeing if actions based upon those yield results.

For example: Kant suggested long ago that the *world-as-it-is* is not formatted in terms of spatial extent and unfolding change (space and time), rather it is our *human perception* that is formatted this way. Furthermore, our *thoughts-about* the world really have very little to do with the world itself - they are "parallel constructions" in awareness - and are therefore not causal or limiting, except to the extent that they limit what we might choose as our intentions.

It's not easy to have a discussion about these sorts of things in a "he said/she said" format, because one side won't be arguing about "facts" at all - they will be discussing the nature of facts, perhaps, and discussing experiences without really promoting any particular view of "what really happened"!

Disentangling Topics

I'm genuinely interested in how unusual topics which require niche background knowledge to fully explore, can be properly discussed in a way that's accessible to a wider audience, and is entertaining, without misrepresenting it. With something as *experiential* as this, though - with ideas that, although not entirely novel, are slightly counter to common-sense - it really is a challenge.

[...]

Putting all that aside for the moment, if I were doing a show where I was just talking to people who had tried experimenting with this stuff, while trying to avoid getting too abstract, I might separate it into:

- The experiences people report having had.
- How people "explain" the experiences people have had.

You could then have the usual discussions about coincidence, confirmation bias and so on (the first stops for accounting for unusual experiences), then if that followed through, something about the nature of experience and of how we account for its content using descriptions.

The difficulty would be to avoid getting trapped in a "he said, she said" argument about the meaning of the experiences themselves, particularly if it's not possible to spend a little bit of time discussing some philosophical points. It can be like trying to discuss "sandcastles" without having first explained "beaches" and "sand". (And even then, without the direct experience those concepts have little value in and of themselves.)

[...]

> I can't guarantee that your views won't be questioned or discussed with you.

Well, it would probably be a fairly boring show without that! :-)

To be clear, my comment wasn't intended to suggest that people should only go on shows where their views won't be explored and challenged - because those two things are what makes a discussion interesting and worthwhile. Rather, I was underlining that, because "dimensional jumping" is a bit of a loaded term, it's worth checking what someone understands by it, so that they know what to expect from the discussion.

For example, if someone thinks that it's about "physically teleporting your body between multiverses that are all happening simultaneously", then that's probably not a good starting point. ("Dimensions" aren't places, as such.) Setting up a "skeptic vs believer" type show that presumes this as the underlying concept likely wouldn't work. In fact, the core of this subreddit probably involves being a *non-believer* in any particular conception of the world vs personal observation. Which does tend to make a discussion about it a little abstract and philosophical, if you go deeper. Perhaps not what you are looking for, depending on who you were anticipating using for the "skeptic" role. Anyway, those are my thoughts!

[...]

Yeah, I just added that last line to be polite, actually. If I had a larger point, it's that it is rarely beneficial to either side to discuss this stuff in a general forum - it's fairly involved to explain it from the ground up - so it's worth checking where it's coming from in advance.

Reply to “Speculative answers to Frequently asked questions.”

A couple of quick points:

> Dimensional jumping is a subset of the "Law of Attraction"

I'd probably say that "dimensional jumping" *overall* is an umbrella for *all* changes to experience; the specific metaphor of "dimensions", meanwhile, is a subset of *that*. Dimensional jumping in its broader sense attempts to be a "meta" view, prior to any particular model of experience or change, assuming only that there is some structure or "patterning" involved (the most basic description that can still "makes sense").

> it is likely the most accurate metaphor for how the system really works.

Although for convenience we usually ignore this, it's definitely worth emphasising that there *is* no "how it really works", and that the idea of there being a "how things work" is itself a metaphor. The actual closest we can get to "how it really works" is probably something like: "you are that which takes on the shape of experiences; you can shift your 'shape' and therefore your experiences" - that's it. Which, of course, is basically saying: you just *do*. This can't really be described, so we often use misdirection to help things along, in both our descriptions and in our exercises. (Everything we do say about it is a "parallel construction in thought", and is itself just another experience at the same level: the experience of thinking *about* the nature of experience and change. And so on. Everything is an experience, with nothing "behind" it.)

This means that if one *does* want to use the simulation metaphor - because they find it attractive and it suggests certain ways of thinking about change that they find useful - they should bear in mind that it is not *you* who is inside a simulation run by an external simulator, rather you *are* the simulator which is "running" the simulation within you.

> Technically that's not how the computer really works deep down, but it is a method to get at the core to achieve results.

And it's worth noting, I think, that it's completely fine to go with the "simplified diagram" version of things like this. We are not saying that "this" *is* "that", we are simply saying that there are benefits in viewing the world "as if" it corresponded to *certain aspects* of "that".

> [There is no "how it works."] It is, but this is such an advanced concept.

But also it can be a very simplifying one: that is, that it is "all experience, no external world" or "all patterning, no solid substrate". As always, it depends on the aim. If it is simply to provide a method which "gets results", then it can be temporarily beneficial to just say: "this is how it is", and in acting from that model they will have experiences "as if" it were true. Ultimately, though, this is somewhat of a dead end, and people start questioning the method, which then affects the results.

To really become free and flexible, and not get lost in disruptive theorising, we have to come to the realisation that the "how it works" is *also* based on intentions and their implications. Not only does performing an act with intention bring about a result, it also implies the context of the intention. In other words: if you go looking for evidence that things are certain way, you will have experiences "as if" they are that way, when they change their mind, another way. Not knowing this can be very confusing.

> So yes, technically in a sense using the simulation metaphor is sort of like picking an operating system and programming language.

Right, in a way. Once we are aware of this - that metaphors are "formatting" rather than explanations - then we are freed somewhat from the tyranny of trying to "understand" a mechanism that isn't there. We can treat the use of a metaphor as a choice of how we'd like things to be, rather than it having to be fundamentally "true". At that point, we realise that we can stop looking for descriptions which explain experience (whew!) because we understand that descriptions are patterns *overlaid upon* - or restructure - experience. Therefore, "how things work" is a pattern in experience in exactly the same way as the pattern of events resulting from an target outcome; they differ in terms of abstraction, not of kind.

> I've added an edit in the post that hopefully helps make that distinction.

Note that this wasn't about pointing out flaws in your post; I was just picking up on some threads for an expanded conversation. You should leave your post as it is - it fulfils your purpose as stated - and readers can then follow what's written in the comments, if they want to dig deeper.

> This recursive logic bothers me.

The recursive logic can be problematic, but I actually think the drive to release oneself from that recursion - the "stepping back" from that - is where you shift to a different context, and grasp your actual situation. The question that we end up asking is:

- What are "you" and what is your relationship to "the world"?

Or shorter version:

- What is the "nature of experiencing" itself? What is the *context* of experience rather than the *content*?

And the answer to that, which is arrived at by (really simple) directly looking at our experience as it is, means we don't need to battle with the recursion issue. Although it's still slightly claustrophobic to try and think of it, because it as something with no "outside" to it, it can't be thought of conceptually, only directly intuited.

> Also, the "you just do" sounds suspiciously like "I am that I am".

Well, it's inevitable we end up with phrases like that, because we're trying to point out that you are the entire moment of experience. Even when you are having the experience of *apparently* being "over here" and the screen is "over there", in fact you discover you are everywhere, just having "taken on the shape of" that experience of apparent separation.

It sounds very exotic, but it's very simple: anyone can close their eyes right now and try to:

- a) find the "edges" of your current experience,
- b) find where "you" are in your current experience.

But of course, it can't really be put into words. We end up with metaphors like: What you are is a sort of non-material "material" whose only inherent property is *being-aware*, and which has all possible experiences "dissolved" within it. It can experience any of those possibilities simply by "shifting" itself to "take on the shape of" that experience. Right now, you have taken on the shape of the experience of *being-a-world-from-the-perspective-of-a-person*.

And a whole load of other metaphors involving blankets, beaches, water, and anything else that's vaguely malleable! :-)

> [Free Will and Determinism] But I can't quite put that into words as to why that is, I just know it as an intuition.

Right! It cannot be thought about, it cannot be described. The essence of it is, while your *state* between shifts is fully deterministic, *you-as-awareness* is not. Awareness is "before" all structure and formatting, and that includes division and multiplicity and, relations and changes in space. So basically, there's no point in trying to work out whether *you-as-awareness* has "free will" because, in a sense, both "free will" and the "working out" are "made from" awareness. However, you can know it directly (intuition). And in fact, this direct knowing is the same way in which you are experiencing the entirety of your current state right now, even though only an aspect is "unfolded" as 3D-extended senses.

Aside - I think that confusing the formatting of the senses with the formatting of the *world-as-it-is* can be a real stumbling block, and is what leads people to think of the world being a fixed 3D-extended "place", and there being an "outside" to their experience even though a moment of directly attending to it reveals there is not. The ingrained idea of the world involving "separate people exploring a spatially-extended place unfolding in time" is a big hurdle.

> Yes, but now it seems more accurate to ask what is the world's relationship to me?

Yes! And I think that urge to reverse the wording is the first thing that comes out of the contemplation of this. And then, having taken that step, the rest becomes much clearer, more easily.

Yeah, time to get some dinner, that sounds like a good idea! Catch you later.

A brief addition, because someone posted a follow-up comment and then removed it, but they brought up a good point, about the difficulty in thinking about this - and the subsequent difficulty you can have trying to think about *anything*. Once you've recognised that *you-as-awareness* as the true nature of experience, you can end up being caught in a bit of a bind. After all, *you-as-awareness* cannot be *thought about*, and trying to think about it can feel either slightly claustrophobic as you try to turn yourself almost inside-out while *having* no "inside" or "outside", or unmoored because you have no stable platform within experience from which to comprehend experience.

Because of this, it is good to take one particular perspective and go with that as your "default formatting". Remember: there is no special or ultimate "shape" of experience you should be aiming to adopt, you don't have to be seeking to constantly experience yourself as an unformatted space whose only property is *being-aware* - because: then what? It is enough to *know* that is the case, regardless of the experience you are currently happening. What we want, then - since there is no "correct" perspective - is to select a basic perspective which is the most flexible and beneficial. The ideal default, I suggest, is to format yourself as "a background space within which sensory experience arises". This places *you-the-observer* as a pure, relaxed, background expanse, with *you-the-content* floating within it. This gives you a stable platform to operate from, to think from. You view the world, then, as "a three-dimensional multi-sensory *thought of* a world, that is floating in the space of a perceiving mind". Other thoughts are then parallel experiences, floating in mind. You can of course then choose to reshape yourself as "being a person in a world" when you want, but you will always have this format of "being a space within which the sensory thought of a world is floating" available to you going forward.

[...]

The intention of something *is* that thing! The thought of something and the actual something differ only in their intensity and their location (3rd person vs 1st person, basically). Isn't this shift in relative position - changing from watching something to being "clothed" by it - actually the essence of what you're speaking of ?

Reply to “On the 'acceptance' of facts via implying them”

> [Q: Bonus: of particular interest is a dream that I had a few years ago in which I was looking for a computer component to install on my computer. I must have spent about 20 minutes on that dream searching for a store which sold the device without any success.
>
> The more I searched and traveled across the dream city, the more it became like a maze and expanded & created more and more streets and buildings ad-infinitum. Until I stopped searching and materialized one in a question of seconds. My ceaseless searching kept implying that I had not found, and that in turn kept me running around like a dog chasing after it's own tail]

So true. It's the intention and its implications that matter, and intending *outcomes* is what's important. What we are really intending is always, at heart, an *experience*.

If we intend looking for something, then that's what we get: the experience of lots of searching. If we intend something is found - or as you suggest, do it indirectly by intending something else that *implies* that it is found - we save ourselves a lot of traveling. This is also why in general life, we should intend where we are going, rather than intending the movements that theoretically should lead us there. The former directs experience towards the outcome, the latter simply guarantees some movements.

[...]

I'm going to riff on the topic a bit, and see if we can't get a bit clearer on the background context. Let's maybe wind back a little and be specific about what exactly we're doing, using our little patterning model:

Model Overview

- What you are is "awareness".
- Awareness is always in a particular state.
- That state contains - or rather *implies* - the full subjective definition of the world (the "world-pattern"), including all past and future moments, all of which are full determined between each intentional shift.
- A state actually consists of all possible patterns of facts simultaneously; patterns are eternal. What defines a *particular* state is the relative intensities of contribution of the patterns.
- The world-pattern also includes the *base formatting* of experience - for example, "spatial extent" and "time is passing" and so on. These structure the basic logic of the apparent world experience; they are by nature more intense, or deeper patterns, metaphorically speaking.
- When we "intend" a change, what we are doing is increasing the relative contribution ("intending") of a pattern of facts ("the intention") within the world-pattern.
- This re-patterning of experience is "dumb". There is no intelligence behind it; you are the only intelligence and the only cause.

This gives us a few things to consider:

Model Implications

- You literally get the pattern you intensify, overlaid upon experience, although this includes the *felt-meaning* of the pattern rather than just any sensory aspect you conjure up via visualisation or whatever.
- Direct intensification of an image, like an owl, will overlay the picture of an owl - and to a lesser extent its extended associated pattern - over all experience, without regard to spatial or temporal context. This is like drawing on a TV screen and the image shining through where there is a gap. *This gives rise to what we would call synchronicity. The experience that arise tend to be "about" the target.*
- Adding more contextual detail to the owl image will restrict the gaps in which it will appear; the more specific the image the more it tends towards corresponding to a particular event. *This tends towards what we might call coincidental manifestation.*
- Adding *felt-meaning* to the image - basically, conjuring the image while knowing that it *means-that* such and such will happen, makes the intention more specific still. *This tallies more tightly with what we'd call generating actual outcomes.*

  This is where the actual power is. It is problematic for people to think about, though, since this *felt-meaning* isn't really experienced as such, or at least not in an expanded way. It's a sort of background dissolved "knowing".
- Then, we have a variant where we imagine an intermediary object while considering that the object *means-that* a certain outcome will be generated. This is what the "sending messages to the universe" type rituals do.
- Finally, we can do a variant where we imagine or directly intend with the world-pattern itself (using mental, physical or even *no* objects). We summon up or imply an aspect of the world-pattern, and then imagine operating upon it.

All of these, despite the appearance of being different due to the differing experiences which accompany them, are actually the same thing: *intending a change of state.*

Model Considerations

So whatever approach we do, the question to ask ourselves is:

- What are we actually intending?

And sometimes it can be:

- Are we even intending at all? Simply performing mental or physical actions may achieve nothing at all, or *at best* the basic patterning that corresponds to the owl example (typically appearing as synchronicity). What is important is the intention which accompanies any action or non-action - and that intention *actually is* the outcome.

So, there is no inherent problem with updating the past or the future or the present, because it is all within the current state, now. [1] The difference between the owls and the Two Glasses, though, is that both of them simply overlay or shift the surface patterns without contradicting "plausibility" - plausibility being the base

formatting of your experience (that of apparently being a person in a location in a world which is unfolding steadily).

Now, one rule that emerges from this picture is that any particular state, between shifts, must be coherent: the world must always "make sense" because it is a *single continuous pattern*. This means that a shift of state must occur all at once; you can't be "standing on" one part of the pattern while trying to tug at another part, if those two aspects are logically dependent as a requirement for world coherence. In particular, since things that you "definitely know" - in the sense of having already experienced them or had them implied - are the most intense patterns of all, overcoming them requires a surrender of control of any aspect of experience which implies those things, as well as firm full intention of the new state. *This*, I suggest - perhaps coupled with incorrect structuring of intention - is why certain areas can be problematic.

Basically, then: full surrender of the current state, plus persistent but effortless intention (while avoiding implying any base formatting which would oppose the change), would be the avenue to explore.

[1] In fact, the reason the owls experiment is called *The Owls of Eternity* is because it often has the effect of producing experiences which apparently must have begun in the past, and even noticing things that "must have always been there" but you can't help but ponder.

> People here are doing nothing but what other people are doing with LoA just with a cooler label

I'd perhaps disagree with that (although it depends on the "people" in question, of course). I'd probably say that the basic nature of experience is, obviously, exactly the same regardless of whatever subject we are talking about - be that LOA, magick, "dimensional jumping", all that. So in that sense, it's all the same. They are all different ways of structuring our *thinking* about it; and our ways of formulating our intentions. The *world-as-it-is* doesn't care about any of that, though, until we intend.

But: some descriptions definitely lead to more productive pursuits than others.

> So, basically the reality is not all that malleable as we so like to think and discuss or no one (that we heard of) has yet mastered the practical use of this world view.

Reality - or we could better call it "experience" - is *in principle* completely malleable because there is no external world or solid thing underlying it. However, if you, say, *imagine-that* there is a stable world which is persistent and has certain habits, then it's probably not sensible to assume that later a casual "wish" is going to overturn that. Rather, events are going to arise which are "plausible" although unlikely; the outcomes will be overlaid upon those existing stable patterns. The world will not break in response to your intention for a pay rise.

So, you are going to have to do some unpicking of the "base formatting" to have completely discontinuous experiences, *or* completely release your attachment to that so you're not "standing on part of the rug while trying to move it". And you can totally do this. The problem is, it's a sort of *not-doing* and it can't be thought about, and ultimately you are destroying the coherence of your world experience if you push this. Even simple exercises like the owl exercise can really mess with your sense of structured reality if you push it a bit (because of apparent retro-causality and problems with separating out memories).

Additional aspect: People tend to keep their mouths shut if they get dramatic changes that go beyond "amazing coincidence", because it raises questions about what "you" and "other people" are, and the nature of the "sharing" of the world, and produces a sort of *meta-world* perspective that doesn't apply *in-world*. Only people who do things accidentally tend to pipe up. Have you listened to the Kirby Surprise interview linked in the introduction post? Worth a listen. (Also: his book has overlaps with the Anthony Peake stuff, so you might find that interesting.)

> Sometimes I've got so tired of all this jazz that I wish I could have the experience of nothing having any experiences

If you've ever done lucid dreaming, you can switch to an experience of "just being" as "void", like that. Thing is, though, eternity is a long time - so to speak - so you will always switch back into a content-based experience "eventually".

Dying is "too boring"! :-)

I've read Anthony Peake also, the other book I think. I don't really go for his theory, but the overall notion of a "private copy" of the world and experiencing continuing regardless (albeit changing in terms of content) would fit in with the overall concept of this subreddit.

Anyway - somehow, talking about this stuff makes it seem *way more* complicated and obscure than it actually is, right? Basically, it's just "the experience you are having right now" plus some direct attending and intending. Any moment can be designated "Moment Number 1" and we can begin from there, forget the previous stuff, the way I see it.

Oh yeah, picking up on something you said: I think there is a definite thing where people don't really want to push this stuff, even if there's something they supposedly really desire and they're really into the subject. And maybe that's sensible for some people: lots of folk get quite upset even with the owls or glasses exercises, and they're just about giving you a sense that there is "something going on" that doesn't match your usual description.

Perhaps being "overweight, bald, wear glasses" is, for some, better than having to ***deeply, truly*** **confront that the world is imaginary in its fundamental nature**, rather than just enjoy thinking about it and being an expert in the *theory* of flexibility? (Can't say I fancy that strategy myself, mind you!)

> [Q: why would i make a reality where i am unaware of the nature of myself - unless i'm doing the 'discovering' now - but that seems silly to begin with
>
> what's the point? i suppose when i become fully aware of the immediate nature of (self-created-)reality then i wouldn't ever again be nescient
>
> but if i never was - why would i be now?!]

Well, you are always your own nature, right? You are always what you are, taking on different shapes. What you are talking about, though, is having a *representation* of that nature, perhaps? Knowing *about* it rather than just knowing-*being* it. But that itself is just another experience!

Meanwhile, there being a "point" to something is an intellectual construct, an idea. Nothing *actually* has a point; it just *is*. This goes back to the assumption people sometimes have that the experience you are having

now was *deliberately, knowingly constructed* - like, pondered and chosen and a self-aware manner: designed. But it wasn't. It evolved by intention-implication, basically. Every time you looked, you saw. Having a model, some self-reflection, now gives you the possibility of deliberately choosing, but even that is just more of the same. You don't *really* know any more about it beyond *being*; it's just that you've now got a "parallel model" from which to select patterns, *also* within awareness.

[But that itself is just another experience!] exactly - so why bother? why bother with the experience or the knowledge of the experience when it's so troublesome

It's not about the experience itself, though - after all, every experience is just a shape taken on by awareness. No experience is special, for sure. Why bother? Well...

What *is* special, is the understanding that an experience gives you. Having a pure "open awareness contentless" experience, or the experience of the facts of the world changing, tells you that your understanding of the nature of the world and of experiences is mistaken. And since your responses to any experiences arises from that understanding, the quality of the ongoing experience is changed. (For example, seeing yourself as a person "spatially-extended place unfolding in time" in markedly difference to seeing yourself as a patterned awareness within which sensations, perceptions and thoughts arise.)

So, the reason to bother in the first place: out of curiosity (since it's not really possible to anticipate the outcome of the investigation). Subsequent discoveries then retrospectively make it worthwhile, since knowing your nature and the nature of experiences makes everything *inherently and directly* more pleasant - and it's then *not* troublesome.

> right - see - it's just utterly futile on this planet because the inhabitants are utterly devoid of any sense and just keep multiplying like locusts.

What inhabitants? Where? How?

> the problem is nothing changes the fundamental pattern of the world.

Nothing changes it if *you* don't change it, for sure. Just having thoughts *about* it usually just generates synchronistic experiences *about* your ideas. You have to intend directly into/as the patterning of the world, to make changes in your experience of the world. You have to be mindful of whether you are increasing/decreasing/shifting the part of your state that is the actual world, rather than a parallel representation you've created about it.

> i.e. no experience I'm having is pleasurable and the only planet I know is awful

Your thoughts about "the planet", perhaps. But your actual sensory experience of it? How is that as you describe? In what way, *exactly*, are you experiencing a world that's crap? Be careful that it's not mostly stories *about* a world that is crap. Do you need those stories to change in order to feel good? Why? And so on. Basically I'm saying: it would be a valuable exercise for you to pin down exactly what constitutes an experience of the world being crap, since that would your starting point for changing it.

More later, but briefly putting aside the "condition of the world" stuff for a moment:

> why bother in the first place?

You are *personalising* something that is not personal. Awareness doesn't "bother" or "make choices" - it isn't any-*thing*. That little description you linked to is just a metaphor, a little story, a way of poetically creating a sense of playfulness. It's not how it actually is. In fact, there just is no particular "how it actually is". The story of "God forgetting itself" doesn't mean forgetfulness in the sense of personal memory, necessarily.

> it seems like a colossal waste of time to go about 'discovering' things i should already know! it's not even enjoyable

But awareness itself isn't discovering anything, as such, and is "before" time and experiences. Rather, it "takes on the shape of" the experience of discovering. The idea of something being enjoyable or not, a waste or not, and the whole notion of "discovering" - these are built upon the pattern of apparently *being-a-person-in-a-world*. Again, you attributing to awareness things which are actually just experiences *made from* awareness.

In a standard physics description, would you say that an atom was responsible for choosing the shape of the objects of which is is a part? It's a similar argument. You are like a "material" who which shape-shifts into states and experiences - and tugging on one part of yourself implies a movement of other parts. You wouldn't say that you *choose* those collateral movements. And in fact, you wouldn't say that you *choose* the main movement, because mostly you didn't realise what you were doing. Even when you do come to an understanding, that description is actually just a pointer to "that which cannot be described" - because descriptions are *also* just experiences, and so are choices.

> ...my comprehension of that turns into frustration at yet-again having to scratch around for something to do or know or experience to move on...

That's the tricky thing. Ultimately you discover that you can't describe yourself because you are the thing that the experience of "descriptions" is made from. But you always *are* yourself - and what you *can* do is discover all the things that you are *not*.

For example, one we come back to: if you close your eyes and "feel out" you discover that "you" are actually everywhere, in all directions. And if you pause and attend to the content of your experience, you find that although you are having an experience of "being here" and the world is "over there", actually they are both made from "you" and are inside "you".

So, if whenever we get lost in thoughts *about* experience, we can always come back to the actual *fact* of experience - now. And then we find that our descriptions are all floating as thoughts *within* that experience, rather than actually describing that experience.

From this perspective, a lot of questions actually become meaningless. For instance, "why" questions only make sense *relatively* within with reference to particular content. In terms of the overall context, they are like "castles in the sky": they are self-consistent sets of thoughts, for sure, but they are just floating in the middle of nothingness, not pointing to anything outside of themselves. You are the sky, and those castles are made from you, and so you can never make a castle that captures you or explains you (you-as-awareness, that is).

If you explore that idea of "things having occurred (or not)" then you have to follow it to its logical conclusion, right down to the details of your personal experience, *now*, rather than just ideas about the world. Which gives us that the only thing "happening" is your sensory experience *right now*. There isn't a "past" or "future" other than the thought of it. There's isn't "a world" other than the thought of it. None of the things you are concerned about are happening right now "out there", in this sense.

You don't need to get any fancier with the concept than that, I'd say.

One implication of this is, that wrestling with a particular aspect of experience persists it, because an interaction that doesn't have a transformative narrative to it simply implies that aspect all the more strongly. By basic patterning, even, if you spend your days thinking about things which irk you, you are increasing the "relative intensity" of those things, overlaying their patterns upon ongoing experience.

In other words, there's a sense in which you have to *forget it* rather than fight it. You don't ever "solve" a problem - rather, you "forget" the problem and thereby shift to residing in the "solved" state?

> [A: Interestingly now that you mention it, in taking the "thing has occurred" to its logical conclusion, I discover that nothing implies it more than effortlessness, non-doing, and perhaps not even intending to change anything at all. I think in the mind of many of us there is deeply programmed the idea that life is like a steering wheel that we must constantly keep our hands on or it will derail.]

Definitely agreed on steering wheels!

You're right there is a real problem with the assumption that ongoing experience needs "maintained" - which itself arises from the conflation of the "sphere of experience" with "sphere of intention", perhaps? That is, that the sensory experience I'm having right now is all I can influence and is all that is logged.

Actually, it is maybe more accurate to say that my intentions apply "globally" and are overlaid over the entire world-pattern, and the current experience just being the part I am "looking at" right now. (Experiences are apparently local; intentions are actively global.) Because, in fact, you *are* experiencing the entire world-pattern right now, it's just that only one aspect of it is "unfolded" into 3D-sense, while the rest is "enfolded" or dissolved into the background and only experienced as a sort of "tone" or "global summary sense".

Without that idea, we are doomed to continually "tinker" with any outcome that doesn't appear in our senses within a very small time frame, because we never come to understand that the world only shifts when we intend - and that our default should be *hands off* between intentions. The problem, we can't work this out in advance, because our descriptions have usually been built from just our local observations; we have to take a chance and experiment with intending wide.

My early metaphor for time was that, implicitly, every possible moment was available, in a conceptual infinite grid (see: time travel version). That itself is related to the configuration/diagrammatic descriptions from Julian Barbour's *The End Of Time* and JW Dunne's *The Serial Universe* - although the idea appears in lots of places, including William Blake's "the bright sculptures of Los's Hall". I think it's an old idea that keeps coming up in different ways. It seems that it is hard to make it stick, though, in people's minds?

> [Q: This is an interesting concept. The "background felt-sense" perception that you talk about, that we constantly overlook. Tom(author of montalk.net) talks about it on an interview with Jason Demaskis, and even says that it is the most important aspect to reality creation/other things. How to go around changing the most basic/behind the scenes beliefs is a huge topic in itself. In my experience, I have noted how immersing yourself in a video game/film/book can for a time take your "background felt-sense" to another realm. I noticed this effect when I watched the film Interstellar, because you are there in Earth with the main characters and then it slowly progresses to them leaving everything behind and even going to a higher dimensional space. Also after being immersed in a lucid dream for a while I tend to get a feeling of being some sort of indestructible deity which tends to go

> away after a while of being awake in the "real" world. Still, how you said, there's something that pulls you away from maintaining those "background felt-sense".]

It also comes up in the philosophy and psychology aspects of Eugene Gendlin's work. He talks of a *felt-sense* for navigating one's current personal situation. However, as with the intending of outcomes more generally, if you approach this as the "dissolved state" of *everything* - the "global summary" of the entire state of *you-as-awareness* rather than *you-as-person* - it's actually much more that.

It's both a huge topic, and not: in the sense that it's like having a pond with all the objects of the world in it "stored" in the same way, and therefore the same approach applies universally. The *felt-sense* actually *is* the world-state (all of it over all time), and your sensory experience merely corresponds to aspects of it that you have "unfolded" into perception. This means that you are literally experiencing the entirety of the world right now. Which is obvious, of course: since there is no "outside" to you, there's nowhere else for it to be, anyway.

I actually think one of the things that defines a more "successful" film, is that it paces and leads the audience by creating a subtle *felt-connection* with them. It leads their *felt-sense* to become an ongoing global sense of the film as it unfolds. This is why there is a difference between films which are "designed" - a series of set pieces with connective filler in between - and those that are "woven" - a situation that evolves as the film progresses. It the former is like stamping an idea from nowhere onto the film; the latter is like drawing a thread from an idea and weaving it into imagery.

Note, both types of film can be enjoyable - but the "designed" film tends to like a fairground ride, where you're always aware you are watching a film, can feel the mechanics; you don't become so immersed in the story or characters. The "woven" film is an immersive *world* and leads you to *be* the film's world for the duration.

For example: even if you enjoyed it, you can perceive that *The Force Awakens* was a "designed" film. It felt somehow shallow, like a sequence of scenes one after the other, and for a world-building franchise it somehow lacked "awe"; the making of the film was very evident in the final experience. Meanwhile, *Interstellar* definitely had its problems with characterisation and dialogue, but it absolutely *absorbs* you in a way that *The Force Awakens* does not.

[[A: I definitely feel what you mean in your example. While I don't read ASoIAF a friend once showed me a quote from the author which definitely resonated with me:

> It is true that I spend a lot of words in my books describing the meals my characters are eating. More than most writers, I suspect. This does draw a certain amount of criticism from those readers and reviewers who like a brisker pace. "Do we really need all that detailed description of food?" these critics will ask. "What does it matter how many courses were served, whether the capons were nicely crisped, what sort of sauce the wild boar was cooked in?" Whether it is a seventy-seven-course wedding banquet or some outlaws sharing salt beef and apples around a campfire, these critics don't want to hear about it unless it advances the plot. I bet they eat fast food while they're typing too. I have a different outlook on these matters. I write to tell a story, and telling a story is not at all the same as advancing the plot. If the plot was all that mattered, none of us would need to read novels at all. The CliffsNotes would suffice. All you'll miss is . . . well, everything. For me, the journey is what matters, not how quickly one can get to the final destination. When I read, as when I travel, I want to see the sights, smell the flowers, and, yes,

> taste the food. My goal as a writer has always been to create an immersive vicarious experience for my readers. When a reader puts down one of my novels, I want him to remember the events of the book as if he had lived them. And the way to do that is with sensory detail.

Now... the big question right now is, what effect does it have in one's immediate reality? If I read a lot of novels about civil wars and harsh survival conditions, enough that it alters my "felt-sense" of the world deep down, does that synchronistically nudge events in my life towards making me experience something like that? In some cases, I have noted a sort of "owls of eternity" type situation in which I run into more content relating to that particular felt-sense.

The above question is important because it's a popular idea among "truthers" that movies & tv shows are used as a tool of "cultural modulation."]]

Great quote.

Yes, I'd say that fictional content *does* result in a "patterning" of our ongoing experience too. And, this becomes ever more obvious if we relax our hold on our state and release our spatial attentional focus - because then our "thought strands" and "main strands" of experience are no longer so divided: to summon an image in strand *is* to overlay it upon strand. However, because of the nature of experience, I don't think it would be useful for "cultural modulation" by others onto you, since both the experience and the "modulation material" occur within *you-as-awareness*. You'd be doing it to yourself, really, in a fundamental sense anyway.

[...]

> > is where lies the importance of that "accepting yourself" business, right?

Just to be clear, though, it's not "accepting yourself" in the sense of psychological acceptance. It's more about *not counter-intending against the current sensory moment*. To give a mundane example: say you intend to stand up and walk to the door, and this starts to happen spontaneously, but then you don't like the feeling of being automatic because you don't trust it, and so intend muscle tension in order to "control yourself" - you've basically counter-intended the state shift you intended earlier. Now, expand that idea to other changes in the world-pattern.

Again, it's sort of "don't stand on the rug and try to move it at the same time".

> > the closest we've got at the moment as an actual method for doing so is the persistent realms concept, right?

Switch to a persistent realm and never come back? If you pause and think what radical discontinuous change would be like, that's pretty much it, right?

Although of course, you never actually go anywhere anyway - from one perspective, you aren't in the room you are experiencing now. You are never really anywhere; you just have experiences "as if" you are. And in that example, it's only a "lucid dream" because you later have the experience of waking up - it becomes a dream *in retrospect* (and because you did it knowingly of course and you've heard of "lucid dreams"). In fact, the idea that every morning we wake up and resume the experience we were having the previous day is really just a *constructed narrative*. The strand is triggered anew each morning - or rather, the morning is triggered anew within a strand.

In all cases, then, the basic nature of the unfolding experience is identical, and we make up a story *afterwards* about its meaning, based on what we felt we experienced "causing". Perhaps the question, then, isn't so much how to generate an experience of an alternate version of the world, it's more what leads us to categorise it one way or another, and what causes us to revert to a previous experience?

> I still can't see how something could come out of the "intending but not-doing and not-thinking-about and am-I-really-intending?" thing...

It's just a way of saying that all experiences are results, and intending is the only cause of change. So, right now, just decide that there is a sphere hovering across the room from you. Place your attention in the space where this spehre is. Now, just decide that this sphere has the power to make your body relax and your eyes see more clearly. See what happens. Did the sphere cause the result? Did you experience yourself cause the result? What caused the result?

[...]

> [Previous Edit] ...even there is no intelligence behind it, I - the character having this experience - am not acting fully consciously, or alone at all, as some people may understand this.

Well, you are never the character, you are always "awareness", but that doesn't mean you do what you do *knowingly* - by which I mean, having a parallel understanding in thought about what it is you are doing, or somehow pre-experiencing the results in detail beyond the specific intention.

So, if you specify a particular outcome - say, intend an exact scene - then that is like you are *defining the scene as fact* by intensifying its contribution to the world. Now, because the world must "make sense", its pattern will simply by its nature shift to accommodate that coherently. You are the only intelligence, but that doesn't mean you have a *thought-based knowledge* of what it will be like to experience that world, beyond the intention, in advance. You won't know the details of the implications of that intention, until you encounter them subsequently. And if you don't even have an understanding of what "intending" is, you'll be even more confused. You are the only intelligence and the only power - but that doesn't necessarily mean you understand what's going on!

Which is what this subreddit is about, basically.

Dumb Patterning Aside: This is like if a mountain doubles its height in a landscape, the landscape doesn't have to "work out" or "know" how to incorporate the mountain, it is shaped as part of the change, just from being a continuous landscape. Now, imagine that you are a person on top of that mountain who "intends" it to double in height. Because you did the intending, you know the state of the mountain as it appears when unfolded into the senses. However, you don't necessarily know the state of the rest of the landscape, because it is not (yet) unfolded into the senses.

> [Neville] didn't go all psychological about the past

Definitely I'm talking about actual world change rather than just psychological change - *but:* in this description of experience, it becomes hard to really say what "psychological change" means, and "the world" doesn't mean quite the same thing as it normally would. We're always talking about our ongoing experience, which arises within awareness, and there's no fundamental distinction in type between different aspects of experience.

However, if we say that "the world" is our main bright 3D-immersive multi-sensory strand of experience, and "psychological experience" is the strand of thoughts and body sensations, then it's clear what we're wanting to change, and that we must intend appropriately - i.e. intend to the pattern of "the world" rather than any parallel thoughts *about* the world.

There's no trick to this, you simply make that your intention; it's like choosing to move your left hand rather than your right hand. There's no "way" to do one rather than the other. But as in that example, describing it in words makes it sound way more complicated than it is; it just *is*.

Reply to “Superhero Dimension”

> OP: Alright this is going to sound stupid. Is it actually possible to jump to a dimension where superhuman actually exists? If so, is it possible for me to gain Superspeed in that dimension?

> Q: No, it's 99.99999999999999999999999999% likely that it isn't possible.

How are you calculating "likeliness" here? What model are you using to obtain your result? Or do you really just mean "I really strongly feel that's not possible, but not for any specific reason"?

While I certainly appreciate you chiming in here and there, it's not much use to anyone if you are going simply be dismissive (and in some previous cases antagonistic), without going into *why, exactly* you believe what you do. One of the main points of the subreddit is to dig into the thinking behind views.

Anyway: The standard answer to this question is that you can create "persistent realm" in a lucid dream, which can be returned and which to all intents and purposes behaves as if it is as "real" as this waking experience. In that sense, it is 100% possible to "jump to a dimension where superhuman actually exists" and to "gain Superspeed in that dimension". What is the difference between this and apparently "really" jumping dimensions? I'd suggest that the only difference is that you "wake up" from a persistent realm, but do not "wake up" from daily life - yet, at least. If one switched one's experience to a persistent realm and then never resumed this experience, though...? That would be what OP is asking for. Although such an experience might not actually be much fun "in reality", I'd say.

> Here you go again typing an entire paragraph of "words" in "quotes"... he wanted to REALLY jump somewhere fast

Haven't you heard? "Quotes" are the new CAPS!

Expanding on that: The reason I put things in quotes - other than when literally quoting a comment or someone else's terminology - is to highlight that the word or phrase is not to be taken at face value, and that its usual meaning or underlying assumptions are perhaps one of the things under investigation. Your glib comment about being "realistic", for instance, would make a good example. Because how, exactly, are you defining or judging what is "realistic" versus what is not? What's the difference between "really" jumping somewhere fast and having an experience *as if* they are? Etc. As they stand, in the context of this discussion, your comments are basically meaningless. One of the points of the subreddit is to engage in some philosophy and unpack these sorts of things. This seems to have gone over your head.

As suggested in a previous comment: Treat this as an investigation into the "nature of your experience" (and of "descriptions"), consisting of experiments and subsequent contemplation of the results. You're meant to reach your own conclusions, really...

Ultimately, **you are led to confront your assumption that you are a *person-object* located within a *world-place***. That is, whether the standard concept that "the world" is a "stable, simply-shared, spatially-extended 'place' unfolding in 'time'" is in fact a completely accurate description of your ongoing experience. (With apologies for multiple levels of quotation marks.)

Reply to “It wasn't a panic attack!”

> I've experienced something that blurred the lines for me between dimensional jumping and the law of attraction.

Really, they are just modes of operating. The "law of attraction", "dimensional jumping", "strong energies" and "being a person hanging out in the world" are all on the same level. It just so-happens that the last of these is our strongest habit and so it seems like the "normal" one, which makes the others seem special.

In each case, what is really happening is that we are explicitly or implicitly choosing a particular worldview or conceptual framework and adopting it, such that we have experiences "as if" they were true. *But none of them are fundamentally true*. There are actually no inherent limitations to your experiential content at all. So don't let the specific labels get in the way of experimenting *or* lead you to overthink things.

Aside - It occurs to me that some of the problems people have with the law of attraction, is that they try to work out how it works - as if there is a pre-existing mechanism that needs to be understood, a technique to be mastered. Actually, you are better to simply *fully commit* to a particular description of "how things work", because that will lead to an experience "as if" that is how things work. Ironically, going looking for the right way to do it is basically an intention to have the experience of searching for a right way to do it...

Reply to “Is dimensional jumping and "manifesting" using the law of attraction the same thing?”

Well, the same fundamental "truth" underlies all of experience, even everyday boring grocery shopping, so everything is of course kinda of the "same thing" in a way. So yes, definitely.

The "dimensional jumping" concept of this subreddit is (see sidebar) one of several metaphors for creating change in your experience. You are not literally changing dimensions - as in, switching to other "places" - you are really changing your own state. The difference between here and things like LoA is that here this is done *knowingly*, you pick your metaphor. But that's just because it includes a certain philosophical angle, which arises from asking the question: how, *exactly*, does intention and thought relate to experience? But in the end it's a case of whatever works for you. Many people prefer to continue to view the world the same way (as a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time") and think of things are being "attracted" to them, and not think too deeply about what that actually means. Because what it potentially means is, the world isn't really a "place" at all and you are not really a "person". That's not somewhere that everyone wants to go.

Having a clear model, though, does give you a definite structure to work within, beyond just trying to "raise your vibration" and so on. And the structure you select also formats your experience simply by its adoption, meaning you both create the path and identify the means of traversing it, simultaneously.

Related: *The Patterning of Experience*

Copy-pasting a previous comment which provides context -

Yeah, the sub's naming is a historical accident really, as reflected in the intro post. Initially it wasn't really "about" what it's become about - that is, having fun exploring the nature of experience for curiosity and utility - and although it's a quirky and provocative name, it does make the initial impression misleading for the casual reader (or the skeptic who isn't a skeptic and is looking for a fight). But on the other hand perhaps a strong and engaging image gets people thinking in a way that a more dry or abstract presentation would not.

At its core, we're talking about the ultimate skepticism: identify exactly what you are sure of, treat that and only that as *fundamentally* true, and absolutely everything else as only *relatively* true. And what you are certain of is one thing, although it is more easily stated in two parts:

1. That you exist (you are aware).
2. That you are having an experience (you are aware of content).

Anything beyond that is about the content of experience, and is up for grabs, and we treat all descriptions of that as provisional, as a convenient or useful or interesting or *fun* fiction only. (*Note -* It is useful to assert a basic level of form to experience though, and say that by default we are an "open aware perceptual space" in which experiences arise, or which "takes on the shape of" experiences. This gives us a ground or reference point for discussion and exploration.)

For instance, take the assumption that "the world" is of the same format as our experience. Although our experiences may arise in the form of a 3D-formatted spatial scene, that doesn't mean "the world" is of that format, that it is a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time". Unfortunately though, our thoughts are *also* formatted in this way (they are experiences too) so it's not really possible to think beyond this. However, we

can certainly take the most generalised version of structure - we can talk of "the patterning of experience" - and, bearing this in mind, at least avoid committing to conceptual frameworks and forgetting that they are "connective fictions" only.

The working model for this is to provisionally treat the world as a dimensionless "infinite gloop" from which experiences are selected, in a manner perhaps comparable to scanning our attention around a 3-dimensional room. Our investigations, then, might be said to be about exploring the nature of the "selection mechanism" and its limits. Those limits, that basic and unalterable formatting, would, if reached, be the structure of the "underlying substrate" of experience, effectively a combination of the structuring of "mind" and "world" (one can't separate the two out). However, if no such limit was reached, then we would have to infer that there *is* no fixed underlying substate, and the patterning of experience is just that: accumulated habitual patterns which are subject to change.

Of course, we could never make a final conclusion here. But that's okay, because this is *really* about freedom of thought and being skeptical of *all* narrative structures, based on (looping back round here) the recognition of the difference between fundamental and relative truth.

Reply to “The difference between low of attraction and dimensional jumping”

Well everything, of course, works the same way, since there can only be one way things work. *But -*

This subreddit encourages you to reconsider things at a basic level - what you are and the nature of experiencing itself - and suggests that there is no "how things really are" and there is no "how thing really work". Whereas the law of attraction tends to assume a particular mechanism, or "formatting" to experience, dimensional jumping advocates reconsidering that very formatting itself. It suggests that if you fully adopt a certain metaphor, then your experience will tend to fall into line with that.

In the end, it strives for the most flexible metaphor possible that ties up to our direct experience of ourselves as a sort of "open aware space in which experiences arise" - hence the metaphors described in the sidebar. They are to be taken literally, in the sense that you can adopt them and have experiences "as if" they were literally true - what we might call "the patterning of experience".

The upshot of this is that, instead of having vague notions of "maintaining frequencies" or "attracting" something, you can adopt *any* metaphor which inspires you to an intention - an intention which *means-that*, or logically implies that, you will get the outcome your desire. *Choose your own mechanism.* Because really the only thing that ever "happens" is intending. However, it is always more important that you recognise the nature of your own experience, since that frees you from having to adopt any particular worldview "true".

Unfortunately, the descriptions tend to be a little abstract at this level, because we are actually trying to discuss the thing "before" thoughts or descriptions, or sensory experiences, or even division and change.

If you are experimenting with producing a particular outcome, then really you should consider it "done" at the moment of the intention. It's perhaps a little easier to do this by following the instructions in the Two Glasses exercise (see sidebar links); just carry on with your life neither anticipating nor debating the result, but also not worrying about any passing thought (you should just let them pass by). Basically, it's about having some faith, but mostly it's about not reacting to what comes up along the way, and therefore accidentally re-intending against your outcome.

But luckily for you...

As to your sense of "awareness of my consciousness", just relax and enjoy it. With that open space, you are in the ideal position to be okay with passing thoughts and fears, without reacting to them. Most people spend their time narrowly focused on an aspect of their sensory experience, not realising that they can release a hold on this and they will "open out" - become that "background space" with sensory imagery just sort of floating inside of it. If you've got that, you don't need to tinker with it - in fact, any attempt to fiddle with it tends to reduce it - just decide that if you occasionally notice you have narrowed your focus again, you will "cease" doing so, and allow it to open up once more. Then, fear or discomfort will be like ripples in an ocean, rather than waves in a glass of water.

You probably feel less like a "person" and more like an "awareness", but that's just because you're not used to it.

As for choosing things, there's nothing more to it than intention - which means, to deliberately increase the contribution of a particular pattern. The "intention" is the pattern, "intending" is the bringing it into mind. All patterns are already existing; you only ever change how much a pattern is going to contribute.

If you think about it: what else can there be? Your sensory experiences and thoughts are all "inside" your open awareness, rising and falling. They have no solidity and can't "cause" anything; they are *results*. The only cause is intention, and the results happen immediately. It becomes true *now* that the event will happen *then*.

Of course, that's not something you should take anyone's word for - it's something to experiment with and test for yourself, and decide whether it is true or not. In small ways, and then in big ways. Only *you* can explore this; nobody can do it for you.

The difference would be, do you feel less like a "person" but more open and *alive* - or instead do you feel dissociated and numb? What you are after is to feel like a big open *alive* space, with your sensations, perceptions and thoughts floating in that. You should feel *good*.

If instead you feel like you have shifted position somehow, but are not open, then you might want to adjust that, by - for example - lightly centring yourself on the centre line of your body (just behind the eyes, centre of the chest, or lower abdomen) to feel a bit more connected.

> [Q: "sensations, perceptions and thoughts" yes. Alive as of means just having the awareness and observing. It feels good (currently I hold it back) but maybe because I am not used to that stillness and feeling pleasant out of the nothing and maybe I decide that is something wrong and artificial. But certainly I am not numb in a negative neither neutral way. I am confused. And maybe it's due to the thought that I won't get any further than this stillness and not have that higher emotions that I know as a person.
>
> Edit: Maybe I am not open that's why it feels like there's no air there and you are not required to breath.]

Sounds to me like you are just settling in and getting used to not constantly reacting and bouncing around like a rollercoaster! Also, it can take a while to get used to that different sense of "location" compared with what you used to have (since now you realise you are sort of "everywhere and nowhere", and always were, in fact). Anyway, I think you'll gradually feel more comfortable with letting go to it, and it'll settle out by itself, one way or the other.

There's nothing stopping you reengaging and having more of a rollercoaster experience again if you want. The open space thing, once settled out, should feel sort of like "open joy" and feel decisively positive (since it's basically near-unobstructed awareness), but it's a position of choice rather than limitation.

I can't speak to the mirror method personally. If you were doing the Two Glasses exercise, then I'd always say to wait until things settle out - days, a week - because results there usually come by "apparently plausible but seemingly unlikely paths" and you can't "get better" at doing that.

In fact, you can't really "get better" at intending as such, I'd suggest. However, you *can* intend persistently until you get "the feeling of something being true", when bringing to mind a particular scene or pattern or whatever which *means-that* you've got your outcome. The trick is to make sure you don't reset yourself every

time you do it - like, to reuse an example I've used before, sitting down again before intending to stand up (you don't end up "more stood up" by repeating the sequence).

[...]

> [Q: The Secret Society of Dimensional Jumpers! Imagine the conspiracy theories that would evolve around us :-D But imagine the excitement if you saw another jumper on a train, wearing some discreet colour scheme.]

It could get very confusing, though, once your ongoing experience got patterned with the colour scheme, owl-style. Soon the world would seem to be entirely filled with jumpers, exchanging knowing glances on public transport!

> [Q: Well true, and you will keep bumping into yourself from other dimensions as well. But still, next time I see someone talking about parallel universes I will make various hints and look at them in the meaningful way. Or shall I make owl sounds? Hoot hoot.]

Hmm, I'll be looking forward to you posting the results of your "look at them in a meaningful way" experiments. ;-) Of course, once we get the eyewear range up and running, none of this will be a problem. (8>)=

Reply to “This sub feels like what /r/lawofattraction is trying to be”

I do think that, as things currently stand, the ultimate perspectives of the two subreddits are quite different, even though from a surface glance they seem similar - and that's why the content differs. They're both *seemingly* just about trying to change your experience.

But here, that's not quite what the underlying purpose is.

Firstly, it's largely about *investigating whether* experience can be changed, by conducting experiments in order to check our usual assumptions. It just *so happens* that a good way to do this is to try and get desired results - and this has the happy benefit of you getting something you want, if the result is a positive one. Nothing is to be taken on blind faith. You do have to do the exercises, or there's no point! (Talking about how "likely" something is, for example, is a waste of time; you'll only know how likely something is if you check.)

This is the "practical" part.

Secondly, this subreddit is also careful about taking descriptions and explanations for granted. Specifically, it's cautious about the *nature* of "descriptions". In LOA-type forums, often we see lots of posts and links about "how the world really works" and various techniques and methods. These are sometimes greeted with enthusiasm as the next "truth". But there is an underlying assumption hidden that there even *is* a "how things really work", and that a description can get "behind" experience and capture that. That's not necessarily the case; descriptions can be seen as just yet more experiences at the same level (the experience of: "thinking about experiences"). Parallel constructions in thought. This also brings the idea of a "method" into question, and highlights the risk of conflating "conceptual truth" (a self-consistent description who's apparent truth is really *structural coherence*) and "direct truth" (a fact about experience that you can apprehend directly, such as finding location of "you" in this moment of experience).

This is the "philosophy" part.

Finally, we do have to make a distinction between people "talking within the framework" of the subreddit, and having blind faith about any particular aspect of it. If you are going to take a line of investigation, you do have to put aside caveats and pursue it fully for the duration. For example, "is *this-idea-for-an-outcome* possible?" is both a practical *and* a philosophical question. It doesn't necessarily means someone "believes" something in the manner of faith without proof; they are exploring possibilities and thinking through the implications.

Meanwhile, from a relevant thread yesterday: Treat this as an investigation into the "nature of your experience" (and of "descriptions"), consisting of experiments and subsequent contemplation of the results. You're meant to reach your own conclusions, really...

Ultimately, you are led to confront your assumption that you are a *person-object* located within a *world-place*. That is, whether the standard concept that "the world" is a "stable, simply-shared, spatially-extended 'place' unfolding in 'time'" is in fact a completely accurate description of your ongoing experience.

No matter what conclusions are drawn, at least from that point onwards the investigator will be living their lives based on an understanding of their experience that has been tested and confirmed, one way or the other.

I think the main content of this sub happens in the comments really, as part of an ongoing discussion. The actual posts are mostly a starting point for that. And it's "moderation by contribution" here mostly, so other than the sidebar-linked posts and the overall perspective, there aren't any "official" posts or views. We think that works better for an open-exploration type format.

The subreddit name: Yeah, in a way it can be misleading if taken at face value, and to an extent it's a historical artefact, but it should really be taken as a *provocation*, I'd say - a challenge to investigate. Posts based on assumptions about the name sometimes lead to good unpacking-type conversations. If I were setting up a new subreddit, though, I'd choose a different name (although probably not one that was much more straightforward).

Like most public subreddits, it's inevitable that it doesn't get to stray too far from a certain introductory level because of new arrivals and the difficulty in developing a strand of thought over a prolonged period (see: /r/luciddreaming and so on, similarly). So this place is always likely to be a transition between one thing and another - but that's fine, I think.

There's also the issue that, in fact, **after a certain point *there's not really much more to say*.** To quote Alan Watts slightly out of context, there's an element of: "If you get the message, hang up the phone." The "posts as seeds" and the level of ambiguity here is actually one way of allowing the perspective to shift around, and different angles to be taken on the same underlying insights and concepts.

> >I don't want to call acceptance of these principles "blind faith," but I'd suggest that contemporary empiricists have acknowledged that accepting these principles largely uncritically allows us to ask more interesting, and more sophisticated questions, by standing on their shoulders.

Indeed. It's not "blind faith" - or *should* not be - though, because one isn't really proceeding as if the principles were "true' so much as they are *useful*. If they stopped being useful, you could just ditch them. And there is no reason you can't simultaneously use *other* principles, even ones which directly conflict with the favoured set, if that works for a particular circumstance (drifting more into Paul Feyerabend here than Popper, I guess).

Conceptual frameworks might be said to be largely "castles in the sky" - more *self*-consistent than they are actually consistent with direct experience, other than a subset of somewhat artificial elements we call "observations". These "observational touchpoints" are the threads which link description to experience, but even the formatting of linkages is *itself* an abstraction, a set of hidden assumptions - ones which potentially pre-filter lines of enquiry, if we are not careful. And so: Science is perhaps better viewed as a loosely overlapping collection of frameworks and strategies, rather than a single "knowledge" or "method" - even though it is rarely represented as such in everyday, even professional, discussion.

And, very loosely speaking, the sort of "meta-strategy" that this implies is the (ideal) overall angle of the subreddit, with perhaps one addition: that the nature of observations *in terms of the direct experience* be included. That is: "truth"?

Reply to “My last post here and a golden nugget of advice for you”

> While I see all related meta-physical perspectives as ultimately the same one from different angles of viewing, I don't want to take away from that concept at the core of this sub or distract from it.

Well, that really *is* one the core concepts of the subreddit, rather than a distraction from it. That is, along with being hardline on the nature of the relationship between descriptions and direct experience, of course. And hopefully putting concepts like "you", "internal", "universal powers" and even "truth" under appropriate scrutiny - since often there is no underlying content when their meaning is unpacked. We can end up with buzzy stuff that amounts to “What is your why?” (awful movie, don't watch it). We have something that sort of feels good to read, but there is nothing really in it. It may actually be the case that you're not certain about the concept behind the subreddit, given the responses you've given elsewhere? They seem quite vague and fluffy and LOA-ish!

To clarify for new readers: As per the sidebar, "dimensional jumping" is set up as an example of a structuring metaphor, one which can be used to formulate intentions and generate "as if" experiences, rather than something literal or even something fundamental in a symbolic way. This ultimately leads to an examination of what our experiences are actually "made from": what the relationship is between "you" and "the world", as a sort of "practical philosophy" investigation.

> Humans are the only ones who wrongly apply these petty, subjective judgments to things.

Although, to be fair, no other judgments are available!

> The words I've used are completely 'empty' on their own of course if you want to look at it that way, as all words are, but they are intended to get the brain cogs whirring as some kind of response.

Words are "empty" only in the sense that they are not aspects of the direct experience to which they (hopefully are intended to) refer. However, they *are* aspects of a particular thinking framework or description. The important thing is to elucidate the thinking framework as best we can, and be clear about how it connects to direct experience (or not). Otherwise we aren't saying anything, we're just creating little "castles in the sky" which kind of feel good, but have no grounding or utility beyond that.

> You seem to be saying that what you deem to be 'within the realms of LoA' is not suited to be here. I see them as ultimately the same...

Yes, they are ultimately the same, but only in the sense that every moment of experience is ultimately of the same *nature* - and one may have "as if" experiences themed in the style of "LOA" or "dimensional jumping".

To be clear, the main distinction would be that LOA takes its various ideas as literally true; "dimensional jumping" in this subreddit is seen as a structuring metaphor (amongst many; the sub just happens to be named after one of them) which is not itself literal. There are no "dimensions" in the same way that an LOA follower (or similar, this applies to any semi-realist approach) might conceive of "frequencies" and "attraction" and "energies" and so on.

And therefore the use of the phrase "as if" refers to the *content* of one's experience being apparently consistent with a particular description, but that description not being a true explanation of the cause or form of the experience (the *context*). In a sense, experiences themselves are not taken literally, but the metaphors themselves *are* literal, in a way.

> Trade 'universal powers' for whatever words you like really. I don't use that term myself but it's one I know others identify a certain understanding with, hence why I used it.

It's surely important to specify what exactly you, as the author, mean by "universal powers", rather than allowing others to "fill in the gaps" with whatever "certain understanding" they might identify with?

Otherwise there's a danger we are simply creating highly nominalised self-referential language which has no content, but has the apparent "structure" of meaning - in the manner of hypnotic language forms, for example.

> My point was, you can choose to judge yourself as 'unworthy' of receiving any given thing for x, y, z reason/excuse, and can just as easily judge the opposite.

Doesn't your post just basically, in summary albeit in a roundabout way, say "you are worthy and the possibilities are limitless"?

Why, *exactly*, is someone "worthy" of receiving anything? Perhaps they are not worthy; we shouldn't just take it for granted that we are. And what leads you to suggest that the possibilities are limitless? And why does this matter?

Without being more precise, there's no discussion to be had. Especially if we're just going to end up saying the equivalent of "the words are whatever they mean to the reader, I myself never use these words"!

You get the idea. As mod, obviously I'm inclined to push back on potentially vague cheerleading posts, just to ensure we're engaging in some of the level of a philosophical investigation (with practical aims), rather than the equivalent of YouTube video buzz-up new-agery! Literal vs metaphorical; connection to direct experience; digging behind the meaning of terms; justifying assertions; etc. And it's one way to turn potentially off-topic posts into a relevant discussion.

> because these 'frequencies' and 'energies' don't fit into your perception.

This, I think, is the root of our disagreement here - although disagreement probably isn't the right word: it's more like we're actually talking about slightly different things. And I think you've inferred that I'm saying that you are *deliberately* being obscure or misleading or deceptive, when what I really mean is that as it stands it's not clear how the description used connects to direct experience. It was not clear to me what you were saying.

And so: Let me set out some thoughts.

For clarity, I'm not talking about "perception". That word implies a *perceiver* who has a certain inherent form, and a *perceived* which is independent of that and also has an inherent form. It tends to smuggle in certain assumptions about "you" (being an object of some sort) and "the world" (being a place of some sort). This in turn leads us, not necessarily intentionally, to view everything as consisting of "things" that are "made from" stuff.

To avoid that, I find it's probably is better to begin with just saying that there are "experiences".

Now, we can have experiences "as if" we are "frequency" - that is to say, consistent with the description that "everything is frequency". We can also have experiences "as if" we are person-objects in a world-place, consistent with the current usual view of ourselves. We can also have experience "as if" were are something like *void-awareness*. And so on.

But the only common thread is, loosely speaking, that whatever we are, is "that which takes on the shape of experiences". And any thoughts about something outside of that experience, are themselves just more experiences: the experience of "thinking about experience". There is no "outside", and there is no fundamental formatting, other than the fact of "experiencing".

In this sense, the possibilities are indeed limitless because it can be directly observed - following some experimentation - there is no persistent structuring. And also, more importantly, it can be directly recognised that everything is "you" (in the sense of *you-as-experiencer* or "awareness"). The direct observation, and the subsequent recasting of the nature of experience and of descriptions, is of course ultimately our main topic here.

So, the above is an attempt to illustrate what I was getting at when picking up on "frequencies" and so on, and indicate the level I was thinking at. It seems that perhaps I appeared to be attacking the *content* of your statements, denying your experience or your formulation, but what I trying to push back on was the *context* of them.

Looping back, now:

> > You state this, and then dismiss any other possibility while implying my words and advice are shallow, because these 'frequencies' and 'energies' don't fit into your perception. I accept that your experience is different to mine.

Yes, no doubt the content of our experiences differ, and the concepts used to describe them differ too. Your post, though, seemed to me to present the concepts as being "true" at face value, and that's why I responded in a way that tried to pull at that a little. (Apologies for any apparent condescension; it wasn't deliberate.)

I'm not dismissing the possibility of *any* experience. But I *am*, I suppose, dismissing the possibility that the *content* of any particular experience or description represents something fundamental.

To conclude on the other stuff: If, as moderator, I didn't challenge a post when the meaning wasn't clear within the context of the subreddit's underlying concept, then we'd become just yet another content-free "inspirational" forum with posts consisting of "beautiful messages" followed by "thank you so much this is just what I need to hear right now" responses. The actual intention is that it is an investigation into the nature of experience and descriptions, within a certain framework which might be loosely described as an experiment-led variant on subjective idealism or non-dualism. That's why there's this pushback from a philosophical angle. Hopefully you understand where I'm coming from now!

[...]

> My post was intended to be certain core ideas I wanted to put out there for people to dive into before moving on from this sub and the internet in general.

The issue was (and remains) that you haven't *actually* clearly laid out your core ideas at all - to the extent that it is not certain that there is a specific core concept to work with, other than a conviction in believing in "limitlessness". Certainly not in the original post, but also not in this or the other response. In and of itself that is fine, of course - but in the context of this subreddit's central themes or the previous comment where I asserted a particular view for you to expand from or contrast with, we've not got anywhere useful.

Now, I love a bit of vague, shifting, comma-delimited, full-abstraction jousting as much as anyone, but in this particular forum it's important to push for some precision! You can't simultaneously claim to be describing core concepts as a seed for discussion, while also suggest that you can't control what other people's interpretations are and that anyway you didn't intend to lead readers in one direction or another. People can't "take in" information by "coming to it themselves", if you don't actually provide any information. Such post-hoc justifications might come over as, at best, disingenuous. But anyway:

If we are to continue, and thus bring the post discussion into relevance for the subreddit, maybe we could tackle one or two particular ideas from earlier, and build out from that:

In what way are we "frequency"?

> From my experience, we are frequency.

In what sense are we "frequency", and what exactly is it in your experience which has led you to believe that this is the case? The observations that lead to this might be either experiential *content* (experiences apparently *of* something), or an observation regarding the actual form of experience more generally that we might call the *context*. The latter I have previously referred to as "direct experience" to distinguish it from the description or narrative *ascribed to* experience (I think you may have misunderstood what I mean by "direct experience" earlier).

In what way are "the possibilities are limitless"?

> I suggest possibilities are limitless because why wouldn't they be? Where is the line and who draws it?

Do you *suggest* that the possibilities are limitless, or do you *conclude* that they are limitless?

If you are *concluding* that they are, then there must be a particular experience or logical framework which has led to that conclusion. If you are suggesting it on the basis of "because why not?" only, then the statement is potentially meaningless. Now, it may be you're just not interested in this sort of discussion. But I hope you are! After all, it is literally the underlying purpose of this subreddit - experimentation and philosophical unpacking - and what distinguishes it from other LOA-type or inspirational-style "reality" subreddits. And that's why we take the time to try and steer ambiguous posts into exchanges of this sort, rather than just moderate them out immediately, etc.

> We are not dealing with mainstream, majority-accepted-and-approved topics. I can only offer a door, and I do. I can only tell you of my personal experience, which doesn't appear to be what you're looking for from me. You appear to be essentially looking for 'proof' from me to convince you to 'see what I see'.

What I have been looking for, is for you to write out a description of your "core concepts" (the ones you have previously stated you came here to communicate) and the experiences which have led you to reach them, so that we can have a collaborative discussion, and explore the topic together.

Since you have resisted doing that, there can *be* no conversation or exchange of ideas - that is, our comments are indeed going to be contentless and of no purpose whatsoever! *That* is the source of the frustration in this process. Belief and proof had nothing to do with it. You are amongst friends here, as regards "non mainstream" experiences and ideas; this was a good opportunity to share and to be shared with, for ourselves and for the wider subreddit audience, and to correct any misconceptions that might have arisen from the original post. So, as an alternative entry point, I gave one possible description, that you might respond to, plus two subsequent seeds for exploration. But the response was, again, essentially word salad avoidance and self-contradiction.

> This leads me to conclude that I'm afraid I am not the right person to debate this with you.

Perhaps. Unfortunately, I suspect that you are simply not a person to have a debate with, at all, on this topic - but alas, experimentation and philosophical debate is the exact purpose of the subreddit! And so we never did manage to bring your post around to being on-topic via comments. We did try though, eh? All the best, in any case.

[...]

> [Q: You have asked me questions I am happy to elaborate on, but have closed your comment with "there is no discussion to be had"...
>
> ...I always felt this was the place for this exact discussion! But you've shot it down before we got the proper chance.]

Not at all! What I actually said was:

> > **Without being more precise**, there's no discussion to be had.

Which was an encouragement to continue and expand on discussion, by clarification.

> > I see now that you dismiss my perspective as being "fluffy", "empty"

No, not your *perspective*. Your *description*. And not exactly: I used the "fluffy" to convey a lack of clarity, and you yourself had used the word "empty" to describe the nature of words, and I responded. Genuinely, as it stands, I found it hard to discern what you were trying to convey with your post, and how it connects to the subreddit's focus, other than just being broadly encouraging that people can achieve their desires. Your comment here isn't very easy to pin down either, I find.

> > I cannot control how you read my words, only how true they ring for me at that point in time.

Indeed, but we can certainly clarify what we mean, and why we mean it. So let's unpack it!

[...]

I do find this very frustrating. I feel exactly the same about your responses, to be honest. I did reread the entire thread earlier today, and it seemed to me to be the story of two people talking past one other (despite, one assumes, equal attempts on either side to *not* do that).

To an extent, it's a clash between different types of language (spiritual-emotional-metaphorical *vs* philosophical-abstract-metaphorical, perhaps, or whatever). However, that isn't entirely it. I think I have genuinely failed to communicate to you what I have been asking, and then as a result you have then answered *other* things or made broad statements which weren't relevant to that, or only tangentially.

Regardless, the upshot is that I never really managed to pin you down in terms of clarification, in connection to the subreddit topic in terms of its focus on the nature of experience and descriptions (as direct experience and as philosophical investigation), and you no doubt didn't get to engage in the sort of exchange you prefer either. That's life on/as beach for ya, I guess!

Reply to “Do not doubt yourself”

Well, I'd like to point out that the sidebar does specifically say: An open mind combined with healthy caution is the correct mindset for all approaches targeted at the subjective experience. Never believe something without personal evidence; never dismiss something without personal evidence.

If you've read any of the more detailed discussions, you should realise it's about the *exact opposite* of something you're are meant to just "believe" in. The general idea, in fact, is about investigating the nature of experience, and also the nature of *descriptions about* experience - ultimately without taking *any* description as being "what is happening" (that is, avoiding the "the reification of abstraction"). Of course, beyond that "meta" perspective, there's lots to discuss, and many different views to explore. And so: You'll also notice that the sidebar mentions the concept of "active metaphors", which should suggest something about the overall idea. (Hint: the "dimensions" of the subreddit name aren't "places", although one should note that "the world" isn't necessarily a place either, etc.)

Now, a lot of this should actually be relatively trivial as a perspective, for anyone who has considered the relationship between experiences and descriptions, be they everyday assumptions or scientific models (with the latter the idea that a description was "true" was traditionally seen as nonsense). But, here, we have fun knowingly exploring the implications of it - and perhaps finding out some interesting things along the way, maybe something more than that.

Anyway - given that it's summertime, I definitely concur with your suggestion to live life, breath fresh air, *maybe* some exercise, and thoroughly explore interaction with "the real world" - whatever that is, exactly. And as moderator, I am grateful for you taking the time to create a user account on a Friday evening specifically to post this PSA; it should be a good seed for weekend conversation.

TL;DR: *Do* doubt yourself, but doubt everything else too, or at least don't *not-doubt* it.

> > OP (a faggot): If we're going to conversate, you will have to address the actual content of my arguments.

Hmm, I didn't notice any arguments.

> > OP: Where is the evidence for believing that you can change your sex or go into a cartoon universe by looking into a mirror?

That's a bit of a misrepresentation of the setup of the subreddit, I'd suggest. It's an inversion of it, in fact. I think you are arguing against your own concept of this, based perhaps on the subreddit name, rather than the actual idea. As noted above, there is no encouragement to "believe" anything. Generally, the idea is that there are a couple of activities one might try out, and then contemplate the experience of doing so, from various different perspectives. Beyond that, there's no particular viewpoint advocated by the subreddit - except the "meta" perspective again noted above, of course.

This works both ways, though: although no particular "esoteric" view is specified, neither is the "standard description" pushed as some sort of corrective response. (Note that you have to make a distinction here between the content of the comments that myself or anyone else might make, the ideas that appeal to them and are being explored, and the "official view" of the subreddit.)

In fact: If you *do* have an argument, it seems to be that, contrary to your rallying call to "do not doubt yourself", you are condescendingly suggesting that people exactly *should* doubt themselves! That is, they should doubt their ability to use their own critical thinking to assess experiences and information.

Also implicit within this, is that it is somehow dangerous to explore interesting ideas, as if one might be somehow captured by them. That seems to ignore the possibility that one can play with conceptual frameworks - try them on and even have fun with them, see how they play out - without having to "believe" in them. This subreddit is meant to be the *start* of personal creativity, not the end of it.

EDIT: I notice you added an extra bit about an "insult to your intelligence" after I'd already replied, so I'll append this:

> I know it's a metaphor. But the metaphors stop there.

They don't, though. The metaphors don't stop there. Whatever a "metaphor" is, exactly. Which is one of the points, as regards the nature of descriptions and their relationship to ongoing experience.

> Why not tell them it's all just psychological tricks that have no bearing on reality?

Because it's not a psychological trick. And it exactly *does* have a bearing on "reality". Again, what ever *that* is, exactly. And so on. I'm not quite sure what you are angry about here - other than perhaps the idea that some people might not agree with you, or aren't to be trusted with reflecting on their assumptions, or something like that. Regardless, it does seem a bit patronising, and not based on a close reading of the subreddit.

> [OP: You are consciously evading my questions. Why do you allow people to place their hope on changing their lives with these "exercises" that have no effect on reality? This is no different from the secret. "The secret" does not work. This also does not work. The only difference is the woman who wrote the secret got rich off of it, while you are selling people hope for free. If you know very well that no one will change their sex through these exercises or actualize whatever else they want, why encourage them to do it? You know it will have no effect on reality, except maybe having them think something weird is going on by experiencing mild "synchronicities" through confirmation bias.]

You are consciously asking questions which are disconnected from the topic at hand, it seems.

For example, in discussions there is a clear framing in terms of "exercises", "experiments", "investigations" rather than "methods" or "techniques". It is regularly pointed out that an apparent link between an act and a subsequent experience is problematic, and cannot be assumed. ("Confirmation bias" has a specific meaning which doesn't quite apply to this sort of thing, but I know what you are getting at.) And so on.

In fact, the conversations are very much focused on the deconstruction of experiences and descriptions of experiences - in both directions - rather than believing that this or that, or what could or should or did happen. I say the content of the subreddit is mainly in the discussions, actually, and intentionally. In the case of your comment there, there are lots of hidden assumptions to pick apart - your use of the word "reality", for instance. What *is* that? And without having conducted the experiment, you have no idea whether such a silly little exercise might lead to an interesting experience, or not. (And "or not" is a result too: if nothing at all happens, there's something to conclude from that. Even if something *seems* to happen, then you have to check you aren't misreading it, or in what context you are interpreting it, etc.)

Otherwise all you have is a default description of the world, perhaps not one you've really thought about very deeply, and if you have so much faith in it - well, that is a belief in an unexamined conceptual framework, a bunch of thoughts, surely exactly what you are opposed to!

> [OP: I don't see how the ideas and exercises here are different from the exercises that are in the book "The Secret." Mind you, I read that book and couldn't stop laughing for days. Just as I don't need to try the exercises in the secret to know that it's fictional, there is no need for me to try the exercises here.
>
> Again, you are still being very evasive. You don't sound too different from a "the secret" or "law of attraction" teacher. When faced with tough questions, they find endless ways to explain why it does not work.]
>
> [OmegaAces: *"Just as I don't need to try the exercises in the secret to know that it's fictional"*; This might be the funniest thing I've read the past month. Thanks.]

A self-styled asker of the "tough questions", eh?

So, apart from the idea that one can conclude something from *not doing* an experiment, especially one which requires zero effort - although it is of course perfectly fine to consider something ridiculous-seeming and therefore have no conclusion beyond that - you are also discounting that *just the fact of participating and discussing the subsequent experiences* is in and of itself valuable and leads somewhere. However, it's not just that you are assuming that you know the nature of the experiment and therefore don't have to do it in order to comment; you are also implicitly assuming that you know... *everything*.

This potentially makes you a "believer" of the worst sort: a believer in an unexamined and vague concept (of "reality"), with a belief that it doesn't even need to be examined. You "do not doubt yourself", I suppose. Which, in turn, is probably also responsible for you holding a view of the nature of the subreddit without having really followed it. Perhaps, again, you feel you "don't need to" in order to draw conclusions. To hold beliefs about it. Perhaps that makes you a "free thinker"?

Again, I'll emphasis: this isn't about a method or belief, and in fact those two concepts would be held suspect also. You are perhaps confusing this with a "law of attraction" subreddit. Or confusing your own concept with *the-thing-itself*. Anyway, there you go.

> > OP: I tried magic when I was a kid. It never worked. I matured and grew out of it. Why would I go back to having imaginary friends as an adult? If it never worked when I was a kid who did not have any "strong beliefs," why would it work now with my mindset?

Magic, imaginary friends, strong beliefs, mindsets - not really related to this, I'd say, although some might sometimes draw connections (which should then be picked apart of course). You seem to think someone's trying to persuade you of something in particular, but they're not. In fact, what "it" is, is what is under investigation. You can join in with that, or not - either is fine!

> > OP: I do like your writing style. It''s very "refined." But thanks but no thanks. I came here to set people free. Can't allow myself to be swallowed up by madness. I have compassion for you. Increasingly, it seems that you are the one that needs help more than any other person here.

Oh well. Thanks for your well-meant comments all the same. Cheers for now.

[...]

[[OmegaAces:

> Whenever someone expresses their doubt, I am excited that at least some people here have some semblance of rationality left in their mind

Rationality is just a feedback mechanism.

> Frankly, anyone who takes these ideas here seriously needs to go see a psychiatrist

Not really, there aren't many people here who require any sort of "psychological assistance" the way I see it.

> This sub is no different from a religion such as scientology

Untrue.

> Only difference is that you get your mind brainwashed here for free.

Your given the tools to experiment with reality yourself. In effect giving you a framework with which to find out whether these things are true or not.

> spend more time interacting in the real world.

What is the real world?

> What tools? Glasses?

That's just for the demo exercises. (The way I see it, at least) You're supposed to eventually find out (over extended experimentation) that the glasses, the mirror, etc aren't what causes the changes, just the catalysts.

> There is probably more magic in that 2 girls 1 cup ritual that's all over the internet than the two glasses exercise.

There's magic in that too!

> Have your magic glasses or mirrors changed anything tangible in your experience?

You could always read through my comment history, but yes, many things. Height, money (consistently through unlikely means), clothes, meeting certain people, etc.

> Can you tell me about your height change? All the other stuff could have been coincidences.

That's why you keep experimenting. It eventually becomes apparent. I specifically used the 2 glasses for the height. Once it was done, I left it alone and under a week later I noticed I became taller.

> How much taller?

3-4 Inches at the time, possibly 1-2 since then, I stopped keeping track after it happed initially.]]

[OP (what a sad faggot, really): 3-4 inches? That's actually very interesting. I give you more respect than u/triumphantgeorge for your transparency. I don't believe in all this, but I wish you more success in your magical endeavors.]

[A1:

1. OP says this is all bull but if someone says they used the exercises to change their height then "there is really something to this."
2. Someone replies saying their height changed
3. OP still says this is all bull anyways

scratches head]

[A2: **Becuase it's all a matter of perspective.** OP refuses to try and examine their own beliefs to see the nature of reality. In their head, they are absolutely 100% correct due to not having the knowledge to make it all "rational" as they claim it's not as they haven't seen a different perspective. **They haven't tried it out for themselves; it's all ignorance and denial** and lol at the person who keeps negging him.]

[A3: Wew lad.]

Reply to “My final post”

As the sidebar emphasises, "Never believe something without personal evidence; never dismiss something without personal evidence". The main underlying idea here is, ultimately, to explore our assumptions about the "nature of experiencing" and the nature of *descriptions* about experiencing, and to draw our own conclusions. In particular, to be skeptical of *narratives*. But I'd hope that nobody approaches this as a "believer" - rather, as an investigator and philosopher.

I definitely agree with the attitude of, if you're not getting anything out of something, then explore something else instead. Particularly when it comes to this topic. I probably disagree with quite a bit of what you've said in your post, though. Not because it is particularly "wrong" as such, on its own terms but because it perhaps - it seems to me - takes some concepts at face value that I would not, although mostly because it perhaps drifts away from the "meta" philosophical perspective that a lot of this subreddit is written from. Experience is what it is, but descriptions... less so!

Quite a few things seem to be implied responses to things that I don't think anyone has said, or at least not that I've encountered as being said, in the way you seem to be interpreting them. For example, to pick a few, randomly:

> >I think "enlightenment" is an actual thing, not just an "experience."

I don't think it's been suggested that "enlightenment" is an experience. Mostly the opposite point is made, I think. That is, that people often report having had amazing and unusual experiences, referring to them as "enlightenment" experiences - encouraging others to engage in practices in order to aim for such "transcendental" moments. But those amazing experiences are just *more experiences*. "Enlightenment" is not an experience; it is the recognition of the nature of *all* experiences. Meditation may or may not end up accidentally giving you that insight; and amazing experiences or a experience of "being a void" may trigger that; but enlightenment itself isn't any one experience. That's why it's often said that there's nothing you can really "do" to get it (and that it's not a thing you can have).

> >"Enlightenment" is not something one can have by just doing a two glasses exercise. It doesn't work that way.

I'm not sure anyone ever suggested that it was. *However,* pushing back against your assumptions, via exercises and contemplation, might lead you to an insight as to the nature of yourself and your experience. And so in that sense, it might. At the very least, doing this shines a light on your unexamined thinking up until that point, particularly if you produce experiences which conflict with your usual world picture. Again, it wouldn't be any particular experience that would be an "enlightenment" experience; it would be noticing something, perhaps as a result of breaking down an assumption.

> >But still, if you want to be an enlightened being, you probably do have to meditate 10+ hours a day

That kind of depends on what "enlightenment" is, and what "meditation" supposedly does. Without unpicking either, it's hard to say. What is it that doing more meditation gives us? Now, I wouldn't say that meditation is *worthless* in a general sense. For a start, it's not just one thing of course; there isn't a one activity called "meditation". More, the idea being challenged is that: meditation -> enlightenment.

> I just don't think that this world is a subjective idealist universe that one can bend to his/her will.

I'd note that this is not necessarily the "recommended" conclusion. The framework of subjective idealism suffers from similar problems to the "*person-object* located within a *world-place*" framework, simply be being a framework. A lot of this is about pushing back against *all* frameworks, even the notion that there *is* a particular "how things are" (that can be conceptualised anyway).

>If you had some technological device that dramatically improved the processing power of your brain, memory capacity, concentration capability, ability to visualize, etc that would probably dramatically improve your ability to manifest things...

Of course, one might then ask what the relationship between "brains" and experiential content actually is, and why the properties of brains would have any affect on the ability to change the world... and what is a "the world" and what is "powerful" and what is a "soul" and what is "you" and what is meant by "God". And so on.

Anyway: I'd stress, I think, that **what's important here isn't necessarily any particular result** (even though I think most people get *something*, an inkling to start them off, despite the exercises basically being everyday actions). The quest for results is really the entry point to challenging our assumptions, our descriptions - descriptions based on concepts like the ones you are using above. It's about being very picky and very clear about how such descriptions relate to *direct experience* (if indeed they do). And if that amounts to "dangerous ideas", then we'd have to say *how, exactly* they are dangerous. The "meta" perspective, you might say; the opposite of "belief".

>But I still don't view this as enlightenment... Enlightenment is realizing what we truly are.

Basically, it amounts to the same thing, I'd say. What is there, other than experiences? You might respond: that which *has* experiences! But when you look for that, you can't find it, and then perhaps starting thinking that "you" and "experiences" are identical...

We might say that this recognition is really a recognition that what we are *is not a thing*. It is "wondrous and mysterious", but we have to be careful that the poetic words don't get in the way of what we are after, since poetic words do tend to imply types of experiences, when what we are after is what is "beyond" any particular experience. The sense in which it is "mysterious" is that it cannot be conceptualised, therefore cannot be understood - it can only be *known*. And it's "wondrous" because it is not of any particular structure, while being all structures, etc. But that there, that's getting caught up in a description *about* it, which is a distraction of the thing itself, of course! Anyway, I think you get the idea.

>But I basically think that all of this is a simulation.

If the brain is the material manifestation of the mind, then what is "the brain" made from, and what is "the mind" made from? Where are they located relative to one another? And if they are of different types of material, how does one cause the other? Etc.

Now, we can dig away at the simulation-style approach for ages, picking apart its different aspects, but ultimately I suggest: If you follow it all the way through, you'll eventually be forced into drawing the conclusion that: there is only one type of "stuff"; this that "stuff" is non-material and has no inherent structure; its only inherent property is *being-aware* or "awareness"; it "takes on the shape of" states of

experience; it is self-shaping and self-causing; nothing ever "happens" other than this self-shifting; this "stuff" is what you actually are and you've just "taken on the shape of" the experience of apparently "being a *person-object* located within a *world-place*".

That is, you'll end up throwing away the whole notion of a simulation, because after you realise there can't be any boundaries of type, it all collapses into one idea, the idea of "patterned awareness". Which isn't of course an entirely accurate concept either, however it is the description which has the "least wrong" about it. And, in fact, that's mostly what we end up doing here I suppose: removing what is "wrong" until we're left with the most basic, self-consistent, version.

> >I am still not convinced that we can do absolutely anything and everything we want in this reality just by intending it.

And that would be fine, right? You're not meant to be convinced by reading stuff other people write. Although, it's still worth digging into *why, exactly* we might not be convinced - and then picking apart *that* explanation too, until we get right back to the fundamentals (of the self, perhaps?). I would say that the devil's in the details here. For example, if for simplicity's sake we say that "the world is made from mind", does that mean we should expect to simply flap our arms and fly? Why so or why not? (Noting that, mostly, people who say things like "why can't I just fly?" have never actually attempted it when you ask.)

In your post, you mention things like "rules". We could rephrase that as, our experiences are certainly *structured*. In other words, we are not coming to this as a void; we are already "patterned". Otherwise, of course, all we'd be experiencing are random disconnected sensory image fragments or the like.

The real question, then, is: *is that structure fundamental?* And from that: *can pre-existing patterning be modified?*

I'd suggest that it is "interesting" to pursue the answers as "no" and "yes", respectively. Now, since "intending" is essentially just a synonym for "self-shaping" (following on from the description of the self above), we might want to be careful with phrasing like "just by intending", because it might be obscuring quite a bit of detail, I feel. For example, if you "intend" for your arm to be in the air, you'll typically have the experience unfold of your arm moving from down here to up there. Why doesn't it just "appear" up there? How does the "just" play into this?

But then, does this apply to *situational* outcomes successfully, which are not so obviously "reality-breaking"? If someone has had outcomes arise in *that* area - repeatedly, of course, to confirm there is "something going on" or not - then what's the difference? Having explored that, can one apply what was done there, now in a "meta" way, such that we can feed the experiment back in on itself?

Those are the sorts of things I'd tend to ponder, anyway. (And "pondering" and "investigating" are definitely the right words to describe the appropriate approach, I feel.)

> >As I said TG, I will not be spamming your sub with my skepticism. So I will contain all of my doubts in this thread.

It's a good thread. Unpacking this stuff is partly the point. I should add that it's not "my" sub in the sense of being intended to promote a particular worldview of which I'm a proponent; it's more meant to be a place

where things are picked apart, with my contributions just being one particular angle, perhaps somewhat variably. The exception to this being, the general "meta" approach of it.

> >I think there are still rules, that can perhaps be overridden...

If they can be overridden, then they aren't rules in any meaningful sense; they are malleable patterns...

> >Surely we are meant to be continuously learning?

Learning *what*, exactly? And *about* what? (Putting aside the idea of being "meant" to be anything or doing anything.)

We are continuously having different experiences, and that includes different thoughts and ideas *about* experiences. That's endless. But the "meta" point would be that none of those experiences ever actually get any "deeper" into experience itself. Just like (cheesy metaphor incoming) how it doesn't matter how complex the ripple pattern, it doesn't really tell you anything more about the nature of "water" or "ripples" in general.

So you might have "in-world" learning, as experiences, but that doesn't apply to the "meta" insight, which you have been calling "enlightenment". Not getting this, is perhaps why people become endless seekers, looking for *the* experience or *the* understanding, but...

> >Surely the human mind/brain cannot understand all the answers to existence.

Setting aside the assumptions implicit in "human mind/brain", this also assumes that existence is structured in a question-answer format. Actually, "questions" and "answers" are "made from" existence. Existence, if you like, "is" mystery in that sense. There's nothing at all to understand about existence, because it's not a thing, and has no inherent structure, it can't be "explained". Mostly what you end up doing (what we've ended up doing) is picking apart how various understandings *fail to capture* existence, rather than how they explain it.

> >But more and more, you seem to be saying the same thing over and over again.

Bah, such is the way of things, really. Well, the metaphors change and evolve and suchlike, but ultimately we're all just saying the same things repeatedly in slightly different ways. I'm not sure what you expect. The answer is - the idea is, really - to make up your own stuff. I'd stress again, though, if my angle on things isn't helpful, then don't waste your time with it. It's not remotely "special". There are plenty other ways of describing and exploring available; and I'm not even pushing my own approaches as particularly great! Remember, too, it's not about it being "true". *Experience* is true, but descriptions are like parallel experiences: they used to point at other experiences and provide ways to talk about them. If they're not doing that for you, then pick another one. You should be synthesising your own ones, of course - after all, the idea is that this is your own exploration of yourself. It should also be noted that other people's anecdotes really don't matter. They might give you ideas for things to try, or different ways to think, but beyond that they're largely irrelevant.

> >but I am not sure if the results were mere coincidences and I have not been able to replicate them.

Replication is definitely the key, as you say. *Repeated* "coincidence", across different situations, with a particular approach (not quite the right word) being the common factor. "Results" may not always be quite the same as "successful outcomes" in the manner of a pass/fail format, though.

As I've linked before, there is a slightly difference in concept between the LOA sub versus this one. That is, this subreddit isn't focus around getting results *as such*. Not about leveraging any supposed "mechanism" or law, anyway.

But, definitely, the two exercises are intentionally structured to "encourage" experiences which illustrate two main principles (which actually turn out to be the same principle really), from which one can extend outwards. Definitely in terms of philosophy, and hopefully experientially. In either case, "doubts" shouldn't matter (if we're interpreting that as a form of passive "belief"). If, that is, there is "something going on".

What does matter, I think, is that the these things aren't viewed as "techniques" or "methods". Better as, perhaps, "exploratory strategies" structured around patterns. In terms of how far that goes, it's deliberately left open-ended, as is what constitutes "success". It kind of has to be that way, because (as we were saying), this really amounts to an exploration of the structure of self. Otherwise the sidebar and intro stuff would be written in a quite different way, of course. (It's quite specifically written how it is, to distinguish it from a LOA or magick or psychonaut type thing.)

All of which can sound a bit vague, but I think that comes with the territory a little. How do you even talk about the idea of reformatting your perspective, for example? You can't really describe "how" to play with "becoming the background space", for instance... because there isn't really a "how". You just have to get a couple of hints of a similar experience (e.g. owls type experiments), and then dig into it.

> > In your words, what do you think would the best and most efficient way to maximize the possibility of getting the specific result you are intending? It seems that too much of this stuff is being left to chance. We're all just hoping to get lucky. What is your success rate? Does 50% of the things you intend, come about? 70%? 100%?

When you say that stuff is being left to chance, what do you mean by that?

> > When I intend, it seems that whether or not the result I'm intending for actually happens is left to chance, like a lottery. You play and you have chances to win, but the chances are very low. It seems like that a lot of times.

So, as I said above, I think you have to be wary of thinking of things in terms of them being a "method" or "technique", and there being some sort of "mechanism" that you are tapping into. Although the structure of language can be a bit confusing on this sometimes, "intending" isn't an *act*, remember, it is not something that "you" are doing to "the world" - it is itself the change in state. In that sense, then, there is no ultimate "way". The "ways" are themselves aspects of your state.

So, very specifically, the two exercises in the sidebar (for example) aren't described as methods, bar the occasional slip of the tongue. For that reason. There are always "results" from intention, but that's not necessarily the same as immediately "getting the exact outcome I planned for", because you are pre-patterned, and intention is an adjustment, not a reset.

This means that the outcomes of intention shouldn't be viewed through the perspective of "pass/fail", but rather as *information* - feedback on your current state. You are probing your own shape. There's "luck" involved only in the sense of "mystery": that you don't know your previous condition, specifically and explicitly, except by how it adjusts with intention.

This prior condition (the fact that you are not in a void state) means that "owls" and "two glasses" don't lead you to suddenly appear on Mars or whatever. However, the principles involved in the structure of those two exercises, tell you all you need to know about intention (which is the only true cause). And they also tell you that "mechanisms" are themselves patterns which can be intended. So that's where you start in your investigation to "get better": you might say can go go "meta" and experiment with "voiding" patterning and/or intending "formatting", and also not re-implying patterns by intending outcomes that are based on them for their structure.

You can see, though, why this "meta" aspect means that nobody else can really tell someone what or "how" to do, because that's the exact thing that's being unpacked: your own condition. This isn't about a specific technique that's promoted or even a specific description to believe in. And that's why this isn't LOA or a subreddit of that type. But of course, this is just my way of talking about it. The subreddit frames itself as a starting point for investigation, not as the result of that!

>And lastly, what is "meta"?

Heh, that a completely fair question, right enough! Generally, something is considered to be "meta" if it is about the subject, one step removed. For example, "metadata" is additional data about the data: metadata within a photograph is data which describes aspects of the image. A "meta" reddit post in a subreddit is a post about the subreddit itself. In this conversation, if we were talking about "content patterns" of experience, then a "meta" perspective might be one which applies to all content patterns, a pattern about all patterns.

In the context of our discussions, keeping a "meta perspective" would mean that as we discuss the world and ourselves and so on, we remain aware of the nature of our discussion: that is, we are exploring "ideas" and remain mindful of what ideas are, what "discussion" actually is, and don't conflate ideas and discussion with somehow getting "behind" our experiences.

>["mechanisms" are patterns too] Is that, for example, how things like rituals come about?

If you think about the *Two Glasses* exercise, its "mechanism" is basically an invoking of existing patterns of experience, such as "level", "intensity", "transition", "transformation", "translation", "identification", "association". They are abstract generalised patterns, to which one attaches other content, and thereby (or so the theory would do) alters it.

But this is really just a version of everyday life stuff, I'd say. When you intend to have your arm wave in the air, then you are bringing the extended pattern associated with "arm in the air", the *meaning* of that idea, into experience. When pouring water from one glass to another, you are similarly bringing into experience the entire *meaning* of "moving stuff". So we're basically talking about meaning and metaphor, *realised*. The distinction between literal and metaphorical collapses!

>"voiding" patterning and/or intending "formatting"

Well, it's just the idea that - according to our little Patterning Model here - all that there is, is awareness in a particular "shape" or overall pattern or "state", which itself consists of all possible patterns eternally, just at different levels or "intensities" of contribution.

Now, it's patterns all the way down, but some patterns would be "facts" (like: the red ball is on the lawn) and others would be "formatting" (like: the senses, spatial extension, moment sequences, etc), and so on.

Although these categories are just for convenience when discussing this, of course; they aren't organised that way particularly.

The idea of "voiding" a pattern would be reducing its intensity of contribution to an effective zero. The idea of intending "formatting" would be to change the apparent structure or perspective of moments, rather than just the factual content. It's "meta" all over again!

For example, right now you probably feel as if you are sort of located in an area somewhere in your head, looking out. This moment of experience has a formatting of apparently being "over here" and the room being "over there". Note that this is different from the *perspective* of the experience; I'm talking about the sense of "being this part of the experience, not that part". However, you could instead adopt a change in the formatting of this, such that you are the "background space within which the whole scene arises". If you do this, you feel that you are "everywhere", as a sort of observer-container, rather than being identified with just that one sensation in your head area. (The next step one could take would be to identify with "experiencing", that is you would be "that which the experience is made from": identifying with awareness. That is a change from "observing" to "being".)

As always, of course, these descriptions are just alternative thinking-structures, in parallel to the main strand of experience. Experience remains what it is: *experience*, not "patterns" or "formatting" or whatever. The fact of *experience* is true; the descriptions themselves are only true as that: descriptions (or: the experience of thinking descriptions). However, by seeking the most fundamental description that can capture the basic structure of a "1st-person" experience, we're freed up creatively in terms of what can be conceived of and discussed, and what can be experimented with.

[...]

> >Life can easily pass one by while waiting for miracles to happen.

Definitely, I think one should *never* do this. Particularly if one is prone to:

> >I am thinking that serious meditation is one way one can improve's one life. So it's a win-win situation, assuming one meditates correctly, and seriously.

That sort of thinking, if not done cautiously. Which is, thinking that if you are just "logical" or do something "correctly" or "seriously", it'll work out. That can be a version of "hoping", just with with some broader more plausible sounding words swapped in. It can be a bit like, "this next thing sounds good, particularly while I don't know much about it yet and can project my hopes upon it - all I need to do, is do it 'right'".

That's how people spend their whole lives being "seekers". Putting their hope into the unknown, checking it out superficially and perhaps being disappointed that it's ultimately a bit boring and a slog after the initial excitement - too much like homework, surely not what they *real* things would be like! - and moving on. So that's the second thing to never do, I suppose: waste life by always just looking to the horizon.

> >serious meditation is one way one can improve's one life.

Perhaps it might (there are certainly nice effects, depending on what exact meditation and so on, and the possibility of insight), but it's important to be more specific in the doing, otherwise it'll just be making the same error again. If the aim is to "improve life", it might, but actually if done "properly" it might also result in

some grim experiences as things unfold, just as even the "daily releasing exercise" does (where you are lying on the floor in the constructive rest position, letting go).

That is, that looking for the "magic action" that'll make everything great, rather than treating things as an experiment, usually leads to superficial experiences and possible endless seeking. If the outcome is judged simply on whether it feels good that time, or a "pass/fail" outcome, then one never really changes. Particularly because, the ideal outcome being sought is, I'd say, not a particular experience or feeling or whatever (although those can be good), but a change of perspective. *That* improves life most, I reckon. So it comes back to that thing of approaching things as an "investigation", without really having a fixed expectation as to the outcomes, or even the *type of* outcome. You *might* then find out useful things for improving life, but that's unproven until you've really dug in - so in the meantime, it's important to improve life using the tools you've already got, rather than waiting for some new amazing-super-tools which you may or may not get a grasp on.

Six months meditating (in a specific way, etc) does sound like an interesting experiment to try.

[...]

So, this sounds like you're somewhat falling into the "gurus and teachings" narrative template (or "pattern"). And the way you use the term "intention" - or "just" intention and its use in contrast to "hard work"- suggests that we're not referring to the same ideas here (intention is not an "act" and it is not *in-world*). I feel that this applies also to many of the concepts in your original post, and to the way you are using the term "universe" - and "existence" and "entities" and "meditation" - in this post. That is, you are talking from a position that is already "too late" in the discussion, so we are talking at cross purposes. Meanwhile, you might consider that there is a reason why, in your research, you'll have heard the siddhis referred to as a "distraction". This reason is to do with the context within which all of these concepts and experiences reside - that is, the "meta" perspective for *all* of this stuff.

Ultimately, it's the same reason that the subreddit isn't about a "teaching", but an *unpacking* of "teachings" and descriptions - and it's not about any particular experience, but an *unpacking* of experiences and the conceptualising of them. Similarly, the sidebar deliberately refers to "exercises" rather than "techniques" or "methods", and in discussions we talk of experiences being "as if" something is true rather than at face value, and so on. All because it's trying to shoot straight for the insight - rather than there being a "path" with a "teacher" and developing "powers" or whatever, all of which can turn out to be slightly nonsensical later (other than being an experience). So, rather than tug at one piece and then another here and never really get to the foundation of this, I think later I'm going to write a response from a "ground up" perspective, and then you can pick at *that*.

> I would still like to know why you can't read my mind, but some of the "gurus" can.

It's potentially a quite meaningless question. A more appropriate formulation of the question would be: why are you having an experience of this person "reading your mind", and not that person "reading your mind", and so on? From which we have:

> It's completely up to you...

Oh well, perhaps not then! :-p

If I may just say - you seem sort of weirdly "offended" somehow. Like you were promised something in particular, and you weren't given it by this subreddit? Or that me, as a moderator here, has taken on the role of a guru or teacher, and not delivered to you what you aspire to? That's not really the setup though, and this subreddit isn't founded on a promise of quite what you seem to be assuming - for a reason. Which is, that none of that stuff matters much, when it comes to the underlying thrust of this, about examining the nature of "experiencing" (and of descriptions about experiencing). In fact, it's more likely to make you fall into a little dream instead. Anyway:

Now, when I say "guru and teachings" pattern, I might equally have said it was a "journey of discovery" pattern, or similar. It amounts to the same thing. By saying this, I'm not disparaging such experiences at all; there is nothing remotely wrong with having these experiences. I'm just trying to articulate a wider point, which encompasses all of this. Which is that they *are* "just" experiences.

It's like looking at the forms made by ripples in a puddle. And then imagining that there is some "world" behind those forms, going off on a big adventure where you discover the meaning of those forms and that world, encountering fascinating characters along the way, learning new powers, battling with entities, maybe being able to summon objects and circumstances, reaching great heights of achievement - and then:

You notice that all of that was still just differently shaped ripples. And: You are the water and the ripples. And even the experience of apparently being a *person-object* in a *world-place* at all, is just a particular ripple within you - and *actual-you* are not an object or indeed anything particular, other than having the property *being-aware* (that is, having the experience of however you are "rippled").

Basically, the thing I feel that you are missing, is that it doesn't really matter what experiences you have, including all these experiences of "flowing love" or meeting "people with amazing powers" and so on. That's just more ripples, just yet more experiential *content*. It's all that the same level, with no one experience actually being more special or getting behind things than any other experience. What actually matters, I'm suggesting, is to notice the *context* of the experiences.

That is, to notice "that which 'takes on the shape of' all these experiences", the *nature of all experiences* rather than the content of any particular one. The "material" of experience, if you like - that actual, non-personal "you" which becomes those moments of *apparently* being a person in a situation ("as if" it were true; consistent with the idea of it, but not actually the true nature of it).

This is what things like that *Feeling Out Exercise* are trying to offer a way into, and what the experiences triggered by the two demo exercises are intended to point to, - drawing attention to a couple of the key counter-intuitive aspects of actual experience (it ain't about "powers" as such), leading to an appreciation of this context. Keeping it simple and stripped down, too, by carefully noting that any descriptions are *themselves* just further experiences. Thereby hopefully avoiding falling into a self-perpetuating dream based on one (related: if you haven't already, check out the Kirby Surprise interview linked in the introduction post, as a nice illustration).

I hope that helped clarify somewhat where I'm coming from here. Elsewhere, you seem to muddle up the idea of "intention" with being a sort of in-world personal "action", and have a notion that an intended outcome would mean there would be no subsequent experience of bodily action - no "hard work" or "effort" - but I think if you think of that from the perspective above, it should be clear how this arises from a misunderstanding of what is meant by those terms.

>Are you really a puppet master of the physical dream world?

I think that was probably a joke reference, actually! :-) Especially if it was in amongst some Nefandi-related banter. I'm actually fairly careful to avoid doing anything other that facilitate discussion or unpack descriptions and ideas, because (as the sidebar says here) it's not meant to be about any particular person and their experiences - ideally, "no teachers or teachings". (And there's this basic issue with that anyway, as I've pointed out, and which we'll cover again below.)

>But reality doesn't work that way.

Your response there is full of assumptions, though. In fact, the exact assumptions that are being pushed back against and explored. In particular, the idea there are individual people which have minds, that all exist as objects within a shared place, and have intent as some sort of "power" which varies in strength, with a struggle to win. In short, it's based on the description structured around you being a *person-object* located within a *world-place*, with "the world" being a "stable, simply-shared, spatially-extended 'place' unfolding in 'time'". I suggest to you that *this description is not accurate*. Or at least, it is not *fundamental*. In particular, *experience is not personal* (even though it can be "formatted" in a way "as if" it was from a personal perspective). Basically, you've answered with "reality doesn't work that way" to a suggestion that you are currently making incorrect assumptions about what "reality" is (you're using those assumptions to structure your response).

I'd also add: "intention" as some sort of personal willpower is not the sense in which that term is being used. It's not an act, or a wish, or a want, or a willing, because those would be things done as a person, an object. How could that even work? How could such a thing influence the world? Rather, it's supposed to indicate something more like a *self-shifting of state*, a "becoming".

>As you say, experiences are meaningless.

They are not meaningless *as experiences*. Results are not meaningless *as experiences*. They are only meaningless in terms of some sort of aspirational descriptive framework where you "win the game" in a fundamental sense. However, experiencing is *in and of itself* meaningful, as a fact, independent of specific content. This same thing arises when the question is asked, "if it's all just awareness, then what's the point"? But that dry wording belies the fact that the only aliveness that there is, is awareness. All experiences being "made from" awareness, whatever you thought was the meaning of an experience in terms of a description *about* an experience, it was actually *awareness itself* that was meaningful. You might even consider that our desire for apparent goals, including your inclination towards amazing powers and control, is actual a desire to resolve our patterning such that we have a clearer experience of simple awareness! So the very thing you are suggesting would make life meaningless, is actually the thing you are implicitly seeking now, that which is giving meaning to your actions!

You might ask yourself: so, what happens when you have an experience of being "all powerful"? Then what? Just more experiences. You don't "achieve" anything, ultimately. But that is fine. I suppose what you might take from this, is that no matter what adventures you have, you've *already won*. Right now.

[...]

> I've got a problem with the idea of not valuing some experiences above others.

That's not necessarily what I'm getting at, in this conversation. It's not about not *valuing* some experiences more than others. Some experiences are certainly more enjoyable, and experiences have different *in-world* meanings in the context of *personal* history and worldview. But that "pleasure" or "meaning" is *part of the experience*. (When I say "experience" I don't just mean the sounds and visuals of the moment.)

Rather, it's about recognising that all experiences are of the same *type* or *nature*: that is, they are all "shapes" taken on by awareness. Or metaphorically, you might say that they are all like ripple formations in a puddle of water. Now, some ripple formations may be more pleasing to the eye due to their association with other ripple formations, but *from the perspective of the water/puddle*, no ripple formation is "special".

Now, since when we are talking about "enlightenment" or at least recognising the "nature of experiences", we are really talking about that recognition that "all ripples formations are 'puddle' no matter what their shape", we can say that no experience is "special" in that context - hence, the idea of an "enlightenment *experience*" is flawed. The insight is not to be found in any particular experience, since the insight isn't about *content*, it's about *context*. I'd add that the urge we all have to create descriptions involving hierarchies can sometimes make grasping this sort of idea quite difficult. Really, it has to be a sort of *direct intuition* as a result, rather than conceptual. (The problem with *all* conceptual thinking is it requires a division of things into objects, and relating them in "mental space" - even if not strictly a 3D space because there is "feeling-sensing" thinking - but here we are talk about something that is "before" division and relation.)

Your description of "Top Special Experiences", then, is interesting, because it moves towards that sort of "direct knowing" experience. I'd suggest, perhaps, that one way to understand why those experiences stand out isn't exact due to their content *as such*, but that in a way they are less cluttered, less *rippled*, and for a moment you are closer to experiencing (really: *being*) just the open water, or the implicit state of the water, unopposed.

This means that those experiences can be the most instructive (since they tip you off that your usual assumptions about the nature of "the world" and "you" may not be accurate), but I'd still suggest that they are not special *in type*. And it's not necessarily true that the experience -> insight, so those who chase those experiences thinking they can lead to something, are potentially getting distracted, thinking of it the wrong way around.

> >...maybe some of this intensity was just me, as an animal, with instincts for human contact, hyper-focusing on the contact...

Maybe your tendency to hyper-focus, in this area and in others, actually works to your benefit - since unlike other people whose ongoing experience is a big splash-around of ripples and responses, you are narrowed down on a specific set of ripples at any one moment. And so when what you are focused upon just "clicks", becomes *direct* with no interference, then you're just *there*.

Now, that may not be "special" in the sense I've been talking about above - but it's certainly pretty damn *good!* :-)

[...]

So I'm a "cult redditor"? *Hmm.* That's not really the idea!

> [A: Can't comment right now - I have a meeting in the George temple - it's a giant wooden "TG" with his posts beamed on all the walls where we just sit and bask.]

Do they hand out free shortbread at the temple? The stuff that comes in those little tartan wrappers? If it is a *genuine*, officially DJ-affiliated George temple, then they so definitely would. Accept no substitute!

Reply to “Who are You?”

One might describe oneself as a sort of non-material "material" whose only inherent property is *being-aware* and which "takes on the shape of" states and experiential moments. There is no "outside" to this.

Note the use of the phrase "shape of... moments" in this description. What this is emphasising, is that you are this whole moment of experience, including the apparent experience of seeming to be "over here" and the room "over there". And "the world" is not a *place* and you are not an *object* within it. The world is more like a fully-defined *pattern* that is "dissolved" into the background of experience - in the background of *you* - whose sensory aspects are unfolded and then refolded as moments. "Jumping", then, would be the amendment of that pattern, leading to a change in the content of the moments which were experienced subsequently. Meanwhile, because there is no "outside" to you, it doesn't necessarily matter how you conceive of jumping; it is the intentional change (or the implication of a change) to the pattern of experience that matters. There is no particular image or method (*any* method really) that is the correct one. Really, it is the assignment of meaning that counts, the accompanying intention of any act.

An exercise to try taken from one of those comments is:

Feeling Out Exercise

... a little exercise can help give us a direct experience of what it means to be the subject to all experience, to recognise that we are not an object and that we are "unlocated". We might close our eyes and try to:

a) find the "edges" of your current experience.
b) find where "you" are in your current experience. *and:*
c) investigate what your current is experience is "made from". *finally:*
d) think about yourself, and then note the location of that thought and what it is "made from".

The conclusions of this are the *direct facts* of your experience - the only actual facts, really; everything else is transitory. Whatever you *think about* your experience is also another experience within this context. You can never get "behind" or "outside" of this, because it has not edges or boundaries; there *is* no behind or outside. (If you think otherwise, then pause and notice that your thought about this is *also* "within" and "inside".)

Which leads us to: *‘If you are the whole projection how do you create that state of mind of "I am everything and everyone" instead of I am me and outside things / people?’*

Well, ultimately that's just another experience, with nothing special about it particularly. So it's not *necessary* and it's not at a different level to any other experience. The only fundamental fact is the fact of *being-aware*, which means absolutely every other fact or experience exists on the level, the same level, of "as if it were true". So it's not something to get up about in terms of an *enabler*, I'd say. However, if you want the experience of that, here's my suggestion: you can simply sit down quietly, cease interfering with your experience (that is, allow body, thought and attention to move as they will spontaneously), and simply intend or hold the idea, nonverbally, of the pattern "it is true *now* that what I am is this entire sensory moment" (or your own formulation). Simply "sit with" this until a feeling of a shift happens by itself. No effort or forcing is required (and indeed this will work against you, re-implying your usual format).

Reply to “Confused on the nature of dimensional jumping”

Ultimately, the point of the subreddit is to investigate the "nature of experiencing" by way of experimentation and contemplation (with attempts at generating outcomes being an ideal way to do this). This involves examining assumptions such as...

> > Out of what I've read though this sub, the experiences that sound legitimate make it seem like an internal mindset change, rather than an external reality change. It doesn't really sound different than the law of attraction (believe something hard enough and it manifests). What's the difference?

...**what is an "external reality"?** Where is this "internal" mindset and what is a "belief"? How, *exactly*, would the "law of attraction" work? What does it even mean to talk of "how it works" with regards to anything?

> > ...as if our consciousness has no connection to our bodies, or can go where it wants.

What are "you", precisely? And what is the relationship between "you" and "the world"? Is the world truly a "stable, simply-shared, spatially-extended place unfolding in time" with "you" as an object located within it (the common default description)? Do you ever *actually* experience that, or is it rather just a thought you have *about* an *idea* of "the world" now and again?

> > This is a lot harder accept and sounds quite a bit more drastic than what I talked about in the last paragraph.

How did you come to accept the default description you are using currently? If you pause and examine your *direct experience, now* - what is there that is truly stable and persistent about it? What are the facts which never change? Is it not the case the only that which never changes can be *fundamentally* true - in other words, "real" - and that all other facts must be *relatively and temporarily* true only? How does this relate to things seeming "drastic" or not?

And so on.

> > I really appreciate how you individually address the points of everyone who asks this question rather than just pasting a summary of the last time you answered. It demonstrates a commitment that I really admire.

Thanks. Even though some questions might *seem* to repeat, I think the context is always slightly different, so it's worth coming at it from multiple angles over time. (And if something *is* a copy and paste, it's better to quote it and maybe link to the original thread is possible, so it's clear.) After all, the point is really to collaborate and discuss, and maybe trigger some new ideas, rather than just "have the answer".

Reply to “For my media studies class I have to make a 5 minute film. Could anyone please tell me their experience with this?”

Ultimately, the subreddit is about investigating the "nature of experience" and the nature of *descriptions about* experience - by way of personal experiments and contemplation of metaphors, and generally adopting a "meta" perspective. In terms of experiences, you should really conduct your *own* experiments (see demo exercises in sidebar) and form your own conclusions! There may be (philosophical) reasons why just listening to "other people's" experiences is not particularly helpful.

I'd *perhaps* suggest that this topic probably isn't the ideal candidate for an easy 5 minute media studies film, since to do it justice you're going to have to do a bit of experimenting, reading and thinking to properly get it - and even then, it's likely more the start of something than the end! (The common initial impression that it is either about "magickal rituals" or about science fiction-type parallel universes or multiverses is incorrect.)

> [Q: I'm new too. In my opinion, this pretty much is witchcraft. They use visualisations, tools, rituals, even chanting to change something about their lives. Witches have been doing these techniques for years. Seems like Someone just connected magick with the scientific theory of multiple dimensions. This is how they explained the Changes one can force upon their life. They must have "jumped dimensions"]

That's not the intention really. The techniques are largely irrelevant in a sense (and they are deliberately called "exercises" or "experiments" because the whole idea of methods can turn out to be an issue). The setup is one step more "meta" than repurposing theories - the very idea of the validity of descriptions as explanations ls also under scrutiny, be that for unusual changes or for ongoing experience more generally.

(There is no chanting and all that.)

> [Q: Oops I thought i read somewhere there was chanting (or something similar)
>
> But other than that I don't follow your reply. Sounds like jibber jabber.
>
> Witchcraft techniques are irrelevant as well. Tools an fancy shit isn't needed to practice. Seems like you guys have the same goals as a witch, but just go about it a different way, and call it something different.
>
> What is a "repurposing theory" I couldn't even find that on Google search
>
> and "one step more meta"??? I never heard that before, Google search turned up "Scream 2", "Ironman" and other movie stuff. I thought it was from a video game haha
>
> "the validity of descriptions as explanations "
>
> WTF? LoL]

"Jibber jabber", eh? Possibly so! As you say, though: you're "new too" and your opinion might, at the moment, be a bit uninformed. (Which is fine of course. That's why it's a discussion-focused subreddit.)

The sidebar pretty much lays it out really, but the background idea is that the "tools" are a starting point for investigating the nature of your experience. So it's half an experimental thing, half a philosophy thing.

And then: Yeah, so we can make "rule-breaking" changes to our experiences, but what is the *meaning* of that? And what does it mean to describe it, for example, in terms of the concept of "dimensional jumping" - can that be taken literally? And so on.

The "validity of descriptions as explanations" part was about how descriptions don't really get "behind" our experiences and tell us what is actually happening; they are essentially just further experiences (the experience of: "thinking about experiences"). So describing experiences in either scientific *or* magickal (or whatever) terms can be problematic - or at least shouldn't be taken too seriously.

The "repurposing theory" part was because you'd suggested that this was about mashing together two theories - scientific multiverses and magickal theory - for another purpose. It isn't. Those two ways of understanding things are just taken as one of any number of descriptions, with none of them being "true".

The "one step more meta" was pointing to that: we don't take any description of "what is happening" as being correct, because we are also looking at what *descriptions themselves are* too. In fact, even the idea that there *is* a "what is happening" might be in doubt!

So - although it's not *exactly* this - the subreddit topic might be better thought of in terms of non-duality or subjective idealism as its starting point, rather than witchcraft. Not so much about getting results, but about asking: what does the fact that you got results *at all* imply about what "you" are, what "the world" is, and how those are related?

> 7kek7: TG your patience in explaining what is almost unexplainable is quite impressive

Ha, yes: I really should get this pathological optimism looked at sometime! But I do feel that although we can't explain these things in the normal manner, we can definitely circle around them in a way that's helpful, in dialogue, at a slightly different angle each time - and so the "thing in the gap" can be implied, even if not articulated directly.

> [A: What he's saying here is the changes you can effect into your life aren't the point. The point is what the changes reveal about reality. The methods don't matter because results aren't the point.]

Yeah, that is indeed the edited version of my "jibber jabber"!

On Magic

> The owls of eternity exercise is a form of what I call Active Will, but one might replace that with...

Ultimately, I suppose, we find ourselves searching for a terms which simply means "redirecting experience" or "asserting a pattern into experience". But then the term often makes it seem like a "special" thing. But it's nothing special: the *thing-itself* is just the raw "shape-shifting" that comes with being "that which experiences, and that which experiences are 'made from'". Deciding to move your arm is *that thing* also, or more generally: changing direction to a new destination whilst the experience of "walking somewhere" is already occurring.

The names we use, then, end up referring to a particular pattern or context for an intention, rather than any actual method or property. Actually, this can present a hurdle if we don't realise it: the urge to attempt to find out what it is we are "doing" that brings about outcomes is, despite being attractive and addictive, always going to be fruitless, because it is the *nature of* "doing" that is the key, rather than any specific "doing". The question to ask is, after a fashion: "What is doing *made from*?". And so, to names: "Active will" might be used to refer to cases where you *shape-shift* a pattern overlay into your experience directly (the owls); "dimensional jumping" might be used to refer to cases where you *shape-shift* an outcome-pattern blended with a structured metaphor-pattern; and so on.

Always, though, the "magic ingredient" is simply the fact that *you-as-awareness* "takes on the shape of" experiences, and so can "shape-shift" causelessly in order to modify that experience, to create an experience "as if" something is apparently true that wasn't true before.

> Well, since last year I've been developing a method for understanding and controlling the "magic" in this world.

So the "magic" *in* this world turns out to be the magic the world is *within* and "made from". That is, it is within and of *you-as-awareness*.

And therefore, strictly speaking, nobody actually has a "latent ability" - because they are not actually a "body" (not fundamentally a person, just having a *person-formatted* experience) and they can't "have" an ability because in fact it is just a natural consequence of the "nature of experiencing". That is, the apparent world is a pattern within you, where "you" means *you-as-awareness* rather than *you-as-person*.

> Can you really define the self as awareness? What about the undifferentiated/unmanifested? Is that awareness? I'm trying to understand how "the unknown" fits into this

I'd flip it around, because talk of the "self" can get a bit circular.

So, "awareness" here loosely means something like the "material" that is all that fundamentally exists, but which "takes on the shape of" a particular state:

- "What you truly are is the non-material material whose only inherent property is *being-aware*, and which 'takes on the shape of' states and experiences on an 'as if' basis, including the experience of apparently *being-a-person-in-a-world*."

From there, your current experience might be *person-formatted*, but you are not a person. Similarly, you don't really have a "self" as such, but you might at the moment have a "self" that you think of yourself as occasionally (a *conceptual* self) and a sense of "self" that feels like you (a *patterned* self, perhaps). But you don't have a self in the sense of being an object within and relative to an environment.

Now, in this description, there is no creation (because time and change are part of a particular sensory experience, which is itself an aspect of a state, rather than something which experiences occur "within"). All possible facts and patterns exist always, eternally. And so:

The "unknown", then, is always known, directly, because it is always there, and there is no "outside" to experience. You can think of it as "dissolved" into the background, always.

If by "unknown" you mean "experiences that I haven't had yet as 'unpacked' sensory images or thought images", then in this description those patterns exist, now, but they just aren't contributing to ongoing sensory experience, relatively speaking, to any notable extent. And intention, or shifting, would be the act of intensifying one fact or pattern relative to the others, such that it is prominent within ongoing experience from that point onwards. Like a *rebalancing* of the contribution of patterns, metaphorically speaking, from some sort of "infinite gloop" or *non*-dimensional landscape.

> > Do you think that world may be just a perception,and that our brain is interpreting reality as best as it can with its 5 senses at disposal,maybe the reality is infinite in every possible aspect.And in relation to that we can only experience a fraction of it which our 5 senses allow us.

I think I'd throw away the notion of "brains" doing anything, initially anyway. Have you ever experienced being a brain? The idea that you are a body or a brain is something you *infer* from the content of your experiences (you see "people" and if you open them up you find "brains") and certain little mental castles of thought you habitually wander around in - but your actual experience, if you attend to it, is something quite different to that.

The highlighted phrase in the comment above is an attempt to capture that essence of your actual experience, the *context* within which all *content* arises. (For illustration, see also: the *Feeling Out* exercise, but actually do it rather than just think about it, since that makes a difference.)

You don't *actually* experience having five senses, or a brain interpreting anything. (Even in a more mainstream approach, without getting into the nature of experiences, this is true.)

Rather, you just experience a seamless single experience, "made from" yourself. And then your interpretation of that experience, your thinking about it, is *also* an experience. There is no "outside" to experiencing; all descriptions are on an "as if" basis also, and are themselves within experiencing, within *you-as-experiencer*.

However, if you view "your brain" as simply a metaphor for the patterning of experience, a handy container concept to which we attach our discussions for convenience, then that's okay, perhaps. If done knowingly. That is in fact how we use the term usually, as a metaphor, albeit without recognising that we are doing so. This blurring of the lines between literal and metaphorical isn't a problem generally in daily life, but when we explore this particular topic, it can trip us up.

Aside - For example, in what sense do you actually experience thinking "in your head"? Thoughts may seem to be located in that area of space, but surely *all* of your experience would be in that space, not just your thoughts, if we were to take the notion seriously?

And so, we have that it's not that "we only experience a fraction" of all possible experiences because of our *brains* and our *senses* allowing us. That's just a way of asking: "how come I'm not experiencing infinity right now?"

I'd say that it's better to say that the patterning or shaping of *you-as-awareness* equates to a selection from all possible experiences (which might be conceived of as being "dissolved into the background" and available). Nothing is *filtering* or *interpreting* as an intermediary, as a process of steps. Rather, you have selected (or implied via other selections) an experience. A formatted, patterned experience of apparently *being-a-person-in-a-whole-world* in its entirety, as if from a "infinite gloop". A bit like being a blanket of aware material, and shaping yourself into folds, where the folds are the shape of *this-total-situation* with an aspect of that being *this-sensory-moment*.

> everything gets complicated and complicated...

I'd respond to that by saying it's the opposite: it is actually *super-simple* but it cannot be conceptualised.

It's the attempt to create a thought-structure *about* it that gets complicated, in an attempt to describe something in terms of parts (objects, mental objects) that does not have any parts (the undivided subject which "takes on the shape of" experiences). The *thing-itself* has precisely *zero* complexity (or infinite complexity, but really *potential* is the better word).

Consider the metaphor of The Beach, which illustrates how you can't think about the context of your experience (the context being what you actually are, and hence you are also the content):

The Beach

The metaphor of the beach - about metaphors. It is not possible to build a sandcastle which captures within its form both "the beach" and "sand". However, the sandcastle *is* both the beach and sand.

You can certainly label one part of the sandcastle "the beach" and another "sand", but the properties of those parts, being of form, will not capture the properties of the beach and sand themselves, which are "before" form.

If you forget this, and start building ("thinking") further sandcastles based on those labelled parts, all further constructions and their conclusions are immediately "wrong", fundamentally, even though they may be coherent structures ("make sense") on their own terms.

To continue:

> it's like there is a pattern of some sort or maybe it is just a delusion...

Well, there is a bit of an issue here, which is that if you go on a search for meaning, you will tend to pattern your experience with the pattern of "searching". Similarly, if you have a sense of complexity, you'll tend to pattern it with "complexity". More abstractly, more meta, if you try to solve ever-trickier patterns, you'll pattern your experience if "patterning".

Aside - Check out the introduction post and the link to Kirby Surprise's interview about his book *Synchronicity*. Lots of nice examples of "patterning" there. And it also illustrates how this stuff can drive you a bit mad, because you keep getting evidence of whatever your current approach is, because your approach tends to imply its own pattern.

All of which points to the fact that it is not the *content* of experience (sensory or thought, which are identical in nature anyway) that is where you find the insight, it is in noticing to *context* to *all* experiences.

Basically, you never "work it out", because the nature of experience is not in fact a "problem" to be "solved" or a "secret" to be "understood" (both of those are in fact arbitrary structures: patterns).

> > Yes i see that i am getting a little bit mad i am going to put this psyhological battle down for some time for my own sanity, I will look into that interview and after some time the battle will continue as it always continues, that is a fundamental part of human spirit its curiosity and inquisitivness....

For sure, but be warned: holding the idea that "the battle will continue" already sets up your experience as one of "battling". And "curiosity and inquisitiveness" in terms of finding a solution to "reality" will just generate more *content* of a "curious" and "inquiring" sort.

The eventual insight is that *no particular* experience or idea is the "answer", but instead *the fact of* all experiences are it. It's a change of perspective, rather than a particular idea or whatever.

Anyway, you'll likely find that a lot is to be gained by just putting all this aside for a while, and just relaxing into daily life. Then, when you do pick it up later, your focus is more "open" and your relationship to whatever you've been reading and thinking becomes clear.

[...]

> [Q: I've never really looked into the owl thing. However when I was a kid my dad taught me a cool trick. We would often sit on the porch and watch cars drive by. We would notice the makes or colors of cars more often if we were actively looking for them. Same as when you might be thinking of buying a new car or a friend gets a new car. You end up seeing more of that kind of car if you keep thinking about it. Seems like sort of the same idea.]

Commonly referred to as "confirmation bias", although that term is often used misused in this context. Regardless, it doesn't really work as an explanation for an increase in apparent *events* though, necessarily (and it's not really an explanation for an increase in *observations* either, really, *as is*). From a previous discussion:

Basically, we should ask: what *exactly* is "confirmation bias" in this case? If the term is taken to mean "noticing patterns that were already there in a three-dimensional environment (a *place*)", then the extreme experiences one can have often seem to conflict with that. If, instead, we expand the term to mean something like "selecting patterns into sensory experience from a *non*-dimensional environment (an *infinite gloop*)", then we've got a description that's more useful, perhaps.

In the first case, "confirmation" refers to confirming ones prejudices. In the second case, "confirmation" is more in the sense of confirmation of a property of experience. In neither example, of course, do we have access to an independent external reference against which to measure the "confirmation". However, in the case of "dimensional jumping" and that exercise, we explicitly recognise this fact - and pushing against ("confirming" *or not*) the standard "world experience" assumptions is actually the basis of the exercise.

A related term is the "Baader-Meinhof phenomenon", which simply refers to seeing more of a thing you have recently encountered. However, since in the case above we are performing a *deliberate* experiment and are possibly expecting an outcome, "confirmation bias" is more appropriate as a challenge to someone's experience and its interpretation. (Although, as I said, most people find this does not easily account for the results, if they persist with it. That is for people to make up their own mind about, though; this is very much a personal undertaking.)

Aside - Meanwhile, you'll notice that the Wikipedia page above is now removed from main Wikipedia, and the B-M phenomenon is referenced unlinked under "Frequency Illusion" in the article *List of cognitive biases*:

> [*Frequency illusion* - The illusion in which a word, a name, or other thing that has recently come to one's attention suddenly seems to appear with improbable frequency shortly afterwards (not to be confused with the recency illusion or selection bias).
>
> This illusion may explain some examples of the Baader-Meinhof Phenomenon, whereby someone hears a new word or phrase repeatedly in a short span of time.]

I included the other link, though, because I think the original full B-M page is a little more "honest", since at least it references the origin of the phrase and offers several views, rather than simply a throwaway "explaining away" line which implies it is essentially already understood.

I think that many references get slightly ahead of themselves in treating *naming and categorising* as equivalent to *explaining and understanding*. Creating terms and connecting them is not the same as truly incorporating them into a useful body of knowledge. In fact, I'd generally take a short pause when you encounter the word "explain" being used with reference to psychological studies, since it often seems to me that there is a philosophical gap lurking beneath it. And also, perhaps, one should be somewhat cautious about the original studies even on their own terms.

Reply to “[AMA Request] TriumphantGeorge”

[Going to take each of these separately, posting the responses whenever I get time. This will make it easier to follow any discussion anyway.]

I see you are also a moderator of Oneirosophy and Glitch In The Matrix. What sparked your interest in dreams, reality and consciousness?

When I was studying at school I decided to look up memory techniques. In the library I found books by Tony Buzan and Edward de Bono about memory and creativity, but also an old book about “journeys into consciousness” in which a group of psychologists did basically the doors to the mind ritual, and Oliver Fox’s book on astral projection. There was also a de Bono book called *The Mechanism of Mind* which got me thinking about generalised pattern formation. So these, combined with my interests in physics and art, kind of dictated my direction from then on.

In terms of those subreddits, I never really aimed to get involved (the reason I ended up here is because the approach seemed “undirected” and I figured few concepts might help people avoid discomfort). I just found myself contributing too regularly. ;-) But it’s interesting that they do cover what I see as the three aspects of this area:

- /r/Glitch_in_the_Matrix collects anecdotes about subjective experience and how it differs from our expectations and assumptions of how everyday-mode reality works, our “objective” notions of the universe. *Reports of the spontaneous behaviour of the subjective experience.*
- /r/Oneirosophy explores the metaphysics of the subjective experience, hammering out the perspective in detail by furthering the language and playing with different concepts. *Metaphors to help us better describe the subjective experience.*
- /r/DimensionalJumping is about directly experimenting with the subjective experience. The *application* of those metaphors to *deliberately influence* the behaviour of the subjective experience.

So: observation > metaphor > application

If there’s a “project” here, then it’s the project to bring knowledge that has become clouded by years of language abuse, strip it right down to the basics, and make it accessible - all based on the key insight that metaphors (“patterned thought”) shape experience, and experience *is* metaphorical.

What changes have you seen in your life when putting to practice your techniques, methods and philosophy?

Probably the best way to answer this is to discuss the underlying motivation, even though it might not have seemed this way to me at the time.

Unwitting Deformation

One of the reasons I think I was driven to investigate this, apart from just curiosity about the nature of things, was because I struggled with certain aspects of living sometimes. I would vary between being relaxed and spontaneous, and at other times not ‘getting’ what was going on, accumulating tension without realising it,

and so on. Everyone has elements of this, but it was annoying to be alternately relaxed and present, then useless and unaware. Why was this? It wasn't obvious that I was actively doing something particularly wrong.

The reason turned out to be: attention and control. By having the wrong concept of the structure of my experience, but being keen to perform, I was directing my experience incorrectly and so constantly deforming my perceptual space. I'd be open and spontaneous and then narrowly located and locked-in, all by trying to "do" things via action. And because attention is 'invisible', it really corresponds to a shaping of perception, it's difficult to realise what is happening. You are changing your own shape without realising it.

Detaching & Triggering

So the major change is actually simple and everyday: my ongoing experience is more "open and spacious", and movement and thought don't involve effort and strain. You realise you have *experiences of* moving and thinking; you don't *do* moving and thinking, and so your point of interaction alters.

The next major change is that, having realised you "insert experience" into the world, or activate patterns, you change your approach to getting what you want. If world is a single pattern coherent and you acquire experiences by "inserting a new future frame into the film" or "activating a pattern so that it later appears in sensory space", then what use is thrashing about it trying to *make* things happen by constant fiddling? I used to do that, and it made for a very rollercoaster life.

So, additional actions *here* don't produce results *there*. Instead, your job becomes to occasionally assert things and otherwise allow experience to flow, knowing that the flow now has your desires incorporated into it. This flowing includes allowing body and thoughts to move of course - being, as they are, just parts of the extended world-pattern, and an aspect of your experience.

The short answer is: "Adopting new metaphors for more fun and less fight"

> **Have you got any tips for a beginner such as myself to start seeing real, positive changes in my life?**

Okay, I'm just going to throw out some random ideas here and maybe something will be useful. For general things:

- *Daily Releasing Exercise* - I've mentioned this before but I think the single most important thing is to allow your attentional focus to relax out. So do a daily releasing exercise where, for 10 minute maybe twice a day, you lie on the floor (feet flat, knees up, couple of book supporting the head) and "play dead". Give up completely - to gravity, surrender to God, abandon yourself to open space, whatever. Allow your body and mind *and attentional focus* to move and shift as it wants. Think of it as allowing your nervous system, or your perceptual space, time to unwind and cool down. The trick is that releasing of attentional focus. If you notice yourself fixed on something, just release again.



- *Be The Background Space* - When you have spare moments, close your eyes and “feel out” with your mind, go looking for the background space in which all experience arises. Feel yourself to be that peaceful aware background and stretches out forever. When going about your day, switch your perspective to being that background. Since the space goes on forever, you can realise that there is nothing beyond that. There is no world outside that is “happening” while you’re not looking at it. All there is, is the immersive “world-thought” that is appearing in your mind right now.

  An expanded version of the above ideas can be found in *Overwriting Yourself*.

- *Fun With Imagination* - You should always treat imagining as if it is a *direct interaction* with your private world. You are *literally* adjusting the relative strengths of various patterns by doing it. You don’t need to worry about passing thoughts; they’re just telling you the relative states of the world-pattern as it is. However, you should only deliberately imagine/say things which you would be happy making a more dominant contribution to your ongoing experience. This shouldn’t be seen as a task though - it’s *fun* to imagine things you’d like to happen, to make vivid your desires! Do so regularly for both what you’d like to happen *and also* to revise previous experiences into the desired version.

  The last bunch of posts, including *All Thoughts Are Facts* and *The Imagination Room*, expand on this.

For other stuff, you just have to experiment. Play with the idea that the world you see around you is an immersive 3D sensory thought, and that you could “declare” that is going to happen, assert new facts, or assign properties and meanings to objects and events. Mostly, try to view it as a 3D pattern which *has no depth* - in other words there is no deeper world behind it, supporting it.

The *What's it all about?* post was an attempt to get some of the background perspective down, with relevant reading material so that people can form their own ideas.

Insanity and Functionality

>Any fear of becoming completely unhinged or insane?

My thinking has been: If experiences are just that, it pays to not take them too seriously. People can get obsessed with certain notions and their experience reflects that back at them as the patterns become more established. There's only one thing to realise, and that's the relationship between consciousness and world in subjective experience.

People messing around with magick and psychology often create unfortunate experiences for themselves, and then by viewing them as external make them behave "as if" they were external. I've always been super-cautious of that sort of thing, and indeed any content. The world may be an illusion, but it's an illusion in the sense that it's not a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time"; it is still your experience regardless.

I think an understanding of experiential reality as being "super-basic" - by which I mean that it's the activation of patterns in a 3D space - helps avoid delusion and maintain perspective, since it brings you back to *experience, now* without interpreting things as external forces or understandings.

Of course, this doesn't mean that you have a great explanation for the patterns you experience in terms of "the narrative" of the content - but it does mean you're clearer about their nature.

World-Sharing and The Objective

> Also, do you have any advice for people struggling with the idea of an objective or consensus reality?

Well, it's just an idea isn't it? It's a trick of language more than anything. The "sharing-model" of the world is one of the most challenging things to think about - and that's because it's inaccessible, it in effect doesn't exist, and by its nature it would be "before time and space" and therefore literally unthinkable. Which is why recent philosophy and physics efforts are often tending towards the "private view" notion (see P2P and QBism) with a handwaving promise to hopefully fill in the blanks on the objective (the nature of "world-sharing") later.

For a convenient working model, it's handy to think of it as private copies of the world, built from a shared toy box of all possible patterns (objects, relationships). In stead of the world being a shared *environment*, it becomes a shared *resource*. In this view, "people" are patterns too just like any other object - collections of possible perceptions of a certain related form. This includes "you" as well; it's just that your experience has taken on the perspective viewpoint of this particular "person". You might think of people's full pattern of possible representations as them being "Extended Persons", of which you see a particular aspect at any moment.

[...]

> Do you know if there were/are any other schools or thought...

I actually think most "religious" traditions have their seeds in this sort of worldview, even if the organised versions of the religion lost touch with, or intentionally corrupted, that knowledge. Christianity itself seems to be rooted in these views, with the Bible's parables being metaphors-for-metaphors, and instructional manual for understanding reality and creating change. Over time, though, all groups seem to lose their way as the message is diluted, misunderstood, or suppressed. And I guess various magickal groups also fall into this category of "communities bound by worldview with the purpose of making change"?

> I read a book called the Fifth Agreement: A Practical Guide to Self Mastery...

I'm not very aware of Toltec, although I've read Carlos Castaneda's books and they seemingly have some relation to it. Browsing the wiki page it's pretty interesting how their recorded history seems to be myth and metaphor, much to the pain of archeologists and historians who want the "real" story. But of course, the myth *is* the real story.

Reading through the "agreements", they would seem to be on the core idea:

- *Maintaining purity of observation*.

Which is a pretty decent approach I'd say. Although without an underlying metaphysics to ground it I wonder how much benefit it brings (perhaps the books explain more?). The *All Thoughts Are Facts* post is pretty much a description of maintaining a world by realigning "inner" observations appropriately.

/r/Glitch_in_the_Matrix/

Reply to “Disappearing bus”

> [OP: So I guess I'll start off by saying that this isn't my story (but I have another story similar to this where it happened to me, I'll post it later) it's my aunts and this was one that I always thought was very interesting. So it start off with my aunt, her husband, let's call him Joe, and their niece and nephew, Steve and Danica (age 7 and 9, if that matters). So while on their way back from Disney land in California they were driving when there car broke down. My aunt says they were somewhere in Baker (I don't know if it's a town or city cuz I'm not familiar with the mainland) and they were in the middle of nowhere and it was getting very hot, like she and the kids hid under a shrub to be in the shade while her husband flagged down a car. So they eventually got a car to pull over and take them to the city (or town?). When they got there they called a tow truck for their car and they went to a bus station. While they were waiting, a bus pulled up and asked them where they were going. They told him and he said something along the lines of "Well it's your lucky day, I have exactly 4 seats left and will get you to where your going". So they get on and my aunt sits the kids down (the seats weren't next to each other so she tried to watch them while in her seat), but Joe sat in the seat that was behind the driver. While they were on the road, Joe was talking to the bus driver and told him about what had happened to them, stuck in the middle of nowhere and having to lug there bags with them everywhere. The driver asked where they were going to stay when they got to their destination and Joe told him that they were staying at such-and-such hotel. (I should mention now that the driver was a middle aged black man, this is critical, really hoping I don't sound racist right now) So there on the bus chatting with the people for a few hours until the bus stops right in front of the hotel they were staying at. The driver helps them with there bags while they get off. They were baffled that the driver just dropped them off right in front of their hotel and was showing such hospitality toward them. When Joe tried to pay the man for the ticket (which they didn't get) and just give him a tip for everything he had done, the man refused. Joe insisted but the driver said that if he wanted to tip him then he would have to go to the Bus Company Office and send it through them. Then he got back on the bus and drove off. The next morning, Joe went to the Office and asked if he could pay the driver. But while he was there and describing the bus and the route (he never got the man's name) the people said that they never had someone on that route. When Joe tried describing the driver himself and that maybe he was just covering for someone, they told him that they didn't have any black bus drivers at all in that area. They tried looking through other things and records but couldn't find the man that my uncle had talked to. He just didn't exist. We have always refers to this story as the Greyhound Ghost Bus story. To this day they never could figure out what had happened or who the mysterious man was.]
>
> > Q1: I love hearing these accounts. :) It's a nice reminder of how much help is available in times of need. :)
>
> > Q2: Or none at all. It's random. It's luck.

Of course, **luck isn't *necessarily* random**; it might just be *unfathomable*.

> [Q2: Luck is either just luck, or a meaningful coincidence. Or neither. It's *random*. :) I'm trying to see this without any "emotional context".
>
> It's hard to be neutral. Where nothing makes any sense, or everything makes perfect sense.]

Or maybe I just like the word "unfathomable"! (And who could not?)

So, if we were to propose the notion of "subjective randomness", would that mean that the "tendency of our affairs" could not be predicted (we can't know whether we are going to be lucky or not) or that no mechanism could be inferred (we know we are lucky people, but can't work out how it comes to be) or a combination or neither? I feel that a defined concept of subjective randomness is required to tackle the "luck" issue.

> > Probably a matter of a true AI.

Hmm. I really think that ***we*** **are the only true AI. The world itself is a dumb pattern, and** ***we*** **are the patterning intelligences.** Perhaps we make a basic philosophical mistake in assuming that because our experience is apparently local, that our influence also is not global. We also make the mistake of thinking that the world "happens" in the same way and at the same time as our experiences "happen", which needn't be the case. Taken together, this causes us to infer external intelligences who influence our world, when it's really a case of not understanding the nature of our own actions and their impact. (Maybe.)

Reply to “A glitch saved my life”

> [OP: I was in London visiting a photographic printing company and I had very clear directions where to go to meet my tutor and the rest of my year group. I was about 5 minutes away from my destination and could see where I was meant to go and was just about to cross the road when I heard a very large lorry coming around the corner. The next thing I know, i'm sitting in a coffee shop I had passed which was on the corner by the crossing I was using with a large coffee in my hand, watching the same lorry I had heard coming towards me go screaming around the corner while being fully loaded with scrap metal and mounting the kerb right where I was originally standing.]
>
> > Q: If there are an infinite number of universes, which consciousness is the primary one? If there's no primary conscious and they're all conscious, then how can someone have the memories from one conscious in another? Perhaps the memories get 'transferred' and consciousness doesn't. So many questions and theories!

It's a mistake, I think, to think of multiple worlds as meaning multiple, physical, spatially-extended worlds. It's more like each person is experiencing their own dream-world (with no real solidity, keeping all their memories, all that) and that those overlap or intertwine, although not directly. You dream the version of your wife that fits your perspective; she dreams a corresponding version of you that fits hers. And so on.

It's worth kinda living with it for a bit, for fun. If you're bored sometime, decide to "pretend its true" for one day and see what happens. Make some decisions in the morning ("My friends are all in a fun mood today", whatever), and play it out.

(The idea that whole worlds are *actually physically duplicated* every time there's a decision, and consciousnesses transferred, never seems very persuasive to me. Kinda clumsy and time consuming and wasteful of 'space'. Why not just cheat instead, and have everyone live a sort of dream based on the the same blueprint, with small tweaks for their individual decisions, etc?)

Anyway, interesting to ponder.

The preference for a dream reality, rather than a simulation, is that it means the rules (habits) have gradually emerged by consensus, by an overlapping of beliefs. Simulation implies it was constructed from "outside". In the dream-reality view, there *is* no outside.

It also means that, yes, "quirky" and discontinuous things can happen, because their is no solid "background" to the world. You *can* manifest your desires as it were - but, y'know, things don't just materialise out of thin air. Stuff happens along the available routes. It doesn't mean you get to just sit there. Your thoughts and body are part of the dream-world too, remember - so their movement is part of the world's movement towards getting what you want. If you suppress their action, you'll struggle to get what you want.

Example: want to do well in your exams, and do you "magick thing". You then have an intuition while at your lectures about which topics will be in the test. Or perhaps, walking along the corridor, you *think* you overhear the professor telling a colleague what topics he will include. You study particularly hard for those topics. You do well in your exams as a result.

It's more like, helpful coincidences (thoughts, inspired actions, events) pop up to help you achieve what you've set out to do. The more 'flexible' your beliefs about the world, the more you tend to notice these things / the more they tend to happen in unusual ways (hard to tell the difference).

> deliberately

This is the key. And, you know, letting 'inspired actions' happen when they occur to you.

[...]

What if no members of your original family are actually "behind the eyes" of their bodies anymore. All are imposters. In fact, as you walk along the street tomorrow, contemplate that perhaps you are the only original in this world now. Absolutely everyone else has been "body-snatched", displaced by parallel versions.

Then contemplate the fact that *they know this*. When they look at you, you can tell they are thinking: /u/keano89 is the only one who has not yet been replaced to be one of us...

Suddenly, you feel an unpleasant pressure inside your head, vision starts to fade...

TL;DR: I actually think it's better to think of each person as their own dream-like universe.

[...]

FADE TO BLACK

*...screeching of tires... a dull, sickening thud... a woman screams...
"George! Oh my god!"... sirens in the distance, drawing closer...
then silence...*

A pause. Pain. Memories, disconnecting, dissolving, reforming,
coalescing into...

INT - AUTOMOBILE - NIGHT

A bewildered looking man, glances around him. He touches his face,
with its expression of dream-like confusion. Glides his fingers across
the smooth, intact windshield before him, a mixture of horror and
wonderment. An attractive woman looks over from the passenger seat:

WOMAN
George, the lights have changed to
green, are we going to this party
or not? You alright?

At that moment a truck crosses the junction, hurtling out of control,
smashing into the car in front.

Yeah, quite a few stories here and elsewhere describing premonitions or "resets". A sort of *taking time back* in some cases. A sudden scene change in the movie; an alternative edit is selected. Possibilities:

- Assuming a single shared reality built from consensus, then perhaps so long as nobody "objects" then this can occur. Your will to live generates a discontinuity for everyone, although memories might not persist. Or...
- We each live in our own personal dream-worlds, but there is some partial overlap and communication. Dying in your own dream is optional, you can reset or leave your current apparent world, whatever. That doesn't mean that my body doesn't persist in *your* dream world afterwards. You dream me in your dream; I dream you in my dream. "Complex intersubjectivity" or entanglement is required. Or...
- There's only my dream. You better all play nice or else. ;-)

Question: We need to account for cases where other people apparently die instead of us, as in today's screenplay example.

[...]

There's something in this. If nothing else, our personal worlds just don't correspond or overlap as much as we might assume - in fact, perhaps they are only identical to the extent that our personal minds are identical.

[...]

> I'm new to this subreddit but how do you know if people are just making this up or not?

Up to you. But you can also use these as a springboard to explore ideas about the world, about people and minds, about memory and history, regardless. How do you know that what you remember about yesterday isn't made up?

Reply to “Found out where all of our missing objects are going”

The source paper is *Teleportation Physics Study* by Eric W Davis, and the quotes come from page 56. The report abstract states:

ABSTRACT

This study was tasked with the purpose of collecting information describing the teleportation of material objects, providing a description of teleportation as it occurs in physics, its theoretical and experimental status, and a projection of potential applications. The study also consisted of a search for teleportation phenomena occurring naturally or under laboratory conditions that can be assembled into a model describing the conditions required to accomplish the transfer of objects. This included a review and documentation of quantum teleportation, its theoretical basis, technological development, and its potential applications. The characteristics of teleportation were defined and physical theories were evaluated in terms of their ability to completely describe the phenomena. Contemporary physics, as well as theories that presently challenge the current physics paradigm were investigated. The author identified and proposed two unique physics models for teleportation that are based on the manipulation of either the general relativistic spacetime metric or the spacetime vacuum electromagnetic (zero-point fluctuations) parameters. Naturally occurring anomalous teleportation phenomena that were previously studied by the United States and foreign governments were also documented in the study and are reviewed in the report. The author proposes an additional model for teleportation that is based on a combination of the experimental results from the previous government studies and advanced physics concepts. Numerous recommendations outlining proposals for further theoretical and experimental studies are given in the report. The report also includes an extensive teleportation bibliography.

August 2004 Special Report
AIR FORCE RESEARCH LABORATORY
EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE CA 93524-7048

You can find out more about Eric Davis here:

> Eric is currently employed as a Senior Research Physicist at the Institute for Advanced Studies at Austin. He is also the CEO/Chief Scientist of Warp Drive Metrics, and has provided contract services to the Air Force Research Laboratory, the Department of Defense, the Department of Energy, and the NASA Institute for Advanced Concepts. He was also a technical contributor and consultant to the NASA Breakthrough Propulsion Physics Program.

His non-theory theory is on page 60 of the report. Essentially he "explains" it as (my *emphasis*):

> ...a human consciousness phenomenon that *somehow* acts to move or rotate test specimens through a 4th spatial dimension, so that the specimens are able to penetrate the solid walls/barriers of their containers without physically breaching them.

It provides some nice imagery though:

> Another property of higher dimensional geometry (Reichenbach, 1957; Rucker, 1977, 1984) is that one can move through solid three-dimensional obstacles without penetrating them by passing in the direction of the 4th (spatial) dimension. The 4th dimension is perpendicular to all of our normal three-dimensional space directions, and so our three-dimensional enclosures have no walls against this direction.

So the idea is that (somehow!) you take an object that's in a particular location, you *diffuse it* across 4D (time), before then refocussing it back into 3D in another location.

[...]

> *'you diffuse it across 4D (time)'*; That's what I understand as well, but why does he specifically say "in the direction of the 4th (spatial) dimension"?

You mean, why does he say "spatial"? Because that's how it is conceived of in terms of unfolding experience [misleading vs the paper, see EDIT later for clarification]. How I might imagine this:

Life as 4D Environment

Our experience is like that of sitting in a 4-dimensional room, but only looking at one region or '3D slice' at a time. Our attention is gradually scanning from one end of the room to the other. To us it seems as though objects appear, change, disappear, but really we are seeing cross-sections of static objects laid out across the room. (e.g. A cone would appear as a dot which expands into wider and wider circles before disappearing completely.)

Teleportation is an experience you have when an object you've already seen is moved along the direction of scanning - so that you *encounter it again* in time. A bit like how Nathan Fillion appears in multiple places at once in that silly scene from *Firefly*.

Teleportation as Unfolding Experience

So, the experience of teleportation isn't *spatial* really. It's about locations in time rather than locations in space. As an unfolding of experience as moments *from your 1st person perspective*, looking through your own eyes:

Moment 1: Seeing an object on the table
Moment 2: Seeing an empty table
Moment 3: Seeing a door getting closer
Moment 4: Seeing the doorframe pass
Moment 5: Seeing another room envelop me
Moment 6: Seeing another table, with the object on it

The object was moved *in time* such that later on our "scanning of the 4D environment" encountered it again.

[EDIT for clarity: In other words, the *teleporter* is instantaneously creating a pattern across 4-dimensional space. The *observers* subsequently encounter that pattern as an unfolding experience in time.]

Implications?

If teleportation *was* possible in this way, then it would suggest something interesting. It would suggest that *all our actions are 4-dimensional*, and it's just our sensory experience that is constrained to 3-dimensions

(scanning the 4th). Whether that constraint is a genuine limitation or simply a matter of habit, is something that could then be debated.

[...]

> Time is not a spatial dimension.

Really? What makes you think that? It's a matter of perspective, surely.

> There is nothing inherent to a fourth dimension that makes it a temporal dimension.

Right. I don't think you are actually disagreeing with me. It's a matter of perspective. Any dynamic pattern described by [x spatial dimensions + time] can be described from a higher perspective as a static pattern of [x+1 spatial dimensions]. In the metaphor, I stick to 4 dimensions because that's all we ever directly experience (any others are diagrammatic conveniences):

- From the perspective of the observers, the situation is experienced as [3D pattern + time]. In other words, 3D moments unfolding as time passes.
- From the perspective of the *teleporter's action*, the situation is experienced as an updating of [4D static pattern]. In other words, 3D moments all laid out.
- The 4th dimension is *temporal* from the perspective of an observer, it is *spatial* from the higher perspective of the teleportation act. Teleportation changes the "4D pattern" which we call an object "out of time" (or if you prefer, *in* time as viewed from a higher dimension, because "change" occurs at that higher level - 5th dimension.)

In other words, I am suggesting that our ongoing experience is like that of your attention scanning across a 4D static object, which a teleporter can update from the next level up.

TL;DR: One perspective's temporal dimension is another perspective's spatial dimension.

[...]

Just to chime-chime in - yes, if you were an object then the "dimension you stand on" would always be a time dimension. However, this is where we get into consciousness and 'what you are'.

Without any preamble or justification, say:

You are yourself dimensionless, a perspective and not an object; you are the subject. You can't be conceived of or even experienced. You might think of yourself as literally "attention". But when we think of "attention" we tend to think of a torchlight focusing on parts of a structure, and this implies a movement and a physicality. Really it's more like a *filter* which allows certain aspects of the whole into sensory experience. It has no physicality or location. Dimensionality is part of the the filtering, not inherent to the universe, just like objects themselves.

Time itself is the name we give to change. We say that time passes, but really we mean that experience changes. Each moment of experience is timeless. There is no "duration" of a moment. If you think you are a "thing that moves", this is a problem. You will always need another dimension in which "the movement between moments of movement" happens. In actual experience, it is not like this. However, we can't conceive of it, because that requires us to imagine an "object" which does the experiencing - at which point we are immediately incorrect.

As you see, this all starts to sound mystical pretty quickly - and we get into the whole distinction between *thinking-about* something and actual *knowing-experiencing* - however if you investigate your own direct experience you'll find it matches.

(You can see why I tried to skip that bit.)

[...]

I included "(time)" to make it easier to understand - because 4D traversal *is* time for humans - but strictly speaking time is *change* and so isn't associated with a particular dimension independent of an observer.

It's probably more accurate still to say that the universe itself is *non-dimensional* - it's just a bunch of "facts". However, our perception and therefore our conceptualisation organises them into dimensions (depending a little on your philosophical preferences).

> ‘The salient element here is that space and time, rather than being real things-in-themselves or empirically mediated appearances (German: Erscheinungen), are the very forms of intuition (German: Anschauung) by which we must perceive objects.’
>
> -- Wikipedia entry on Immanuel Kant's *Transcendental Idealism*

[...]

> > No, you seem be misunderstanding. When physicists talk about dimensions, it is common to distinguish spatial and temporal dimensions, regardless of their number. This paper is speculating about rotation through a 4th spatial dimension. Time simply has nothing to do with this discussion, regardless of your conception of it.

Yeah, I do understand. But I was trying to provide an intuitive connection between the description of the action and the world as we subsequently experience it, perhaps confusingly.

[EDIT: Note, I'm talking about "p-Teleportation" here, which is performed on an object by a person unaided. I think we can't talk about that without connecting the act to the experience as it appears to unfold in time. My attempt below is probably isn't very clear, alas.]

What he's saying is that teleportation can in effect be described as a translation/diffusion across a higher-dimensional configuration space such that (x1, y1, z1) becomes (x2, y2, x2). It's not really an explanation yet though, since it doesn't connect to action or observation. In particular, I'm not sure it accounts for examples where the object disappeared for a while, and then materialised some time later, *without additional action from the teleporter*. This suggests that the teleport action might be better described as defining a sequence of events - in the form of a pattern, created at that moment, across 4D space - which the observers subsequently encounter. It's in this sense that I'm equating the 4D used for the action (the "direction" that the pattern was created along in configuration space) and the 4D of time (the subsequent experiences of the human observers in time).

[...]

Good summary of how it's described in the paper! I think it doesn't really work as an explanation for the effect, just as you suggest. Moving something 3D, "outside" 3D?

That's why I was thinking it makes more sense to say that an object isn't a *thing*, but is instead a higher-dimensional *extended pattern*. We can then think of an object as a pattern spread out across a spacetime 4D landscape, which you and I experience one 3D 'slice' per moment.

This means the teleporter doesn't really move the object through walls at all, they modify its pattern across that 4D landscape.

In *this* explanation the 4th dimension corresponds to a spatial dimension (for the pattern) which is also a temporal dimension (experienced by humans as "time"). It ties together the change made by the teleporter and our subsequent experience of the object being in a different place.

That's what I tried to describe in my comments earlier, but I think I may have confused more than illuminated.

EDIT: The reason for this approach perhaps being appealing is that it could also be used for describing other PK effects. Even just having a "patterns across a time landscape" concept is very helpful.

I should say that I think string theory is a complete hack job in its introduction and handling of arbitrary "dimensions", so I'm sticking to the four subjectively perceivable ones. In the end, I suspect it is our *minds* which have dimensional formatting, not the universe. (See George Ellis's good *Nature* article from last year on string theory & friends.)

> I think string theory is not well understood by everyone outside of it...

Agreed on string theory. My issue with it is that it brings to mind 'serial universe' theories of the early 20th century. They are really mathematical-philosophical constructs rather than scientific, testable theories. There are useful ways of thinking though, but their connection to actual observations becomes pretty remote.

> What I would like to see is how the objects are moved from one place to the other.

Yes, this is an important area. It's not necessarily true that the change can't happen *semi*-instantly, though - if it's happening from a higher-dimensional perspective, then it's not *our* time that it's unfolding in. Even the word "happening" might not be a very good description.

But it depends on the nature of the change, which isn't clear at all from the experiment.

> All in all, I still think something's fishy in this experiment.

Yes, maybe. There may be a difference between *moving* an apple (like levitating it) and changing its location (teleporting it). The latter might more be like *updating the co-ordinates* from (x1, y1, z1) to (x2, y2, z2) by focusing on the target location.

Again, it depends on the nature of the change. How were the teleporters going about this, as perceived in their own minds? Were they "moving the object" or were they "editing facts of the universe"?

> Unless their explanation is that we only see the 3D projection of the object and the telekinesis happens because people are able to influence higher dimensions and not the "regular" ones. But this is really far-fetched.

It might be the most efficient explanation.

Simply because we only experience a 3D sensory environment, doesn't mean our intentions don't apply 4-dimensionally, say. In fact, if we decide to raise our arm, might that be described as created a pattern across 4-dimensions which we subsequently experience in 3D 'sensory slices'?

The problem with this area is that we inevitably get into philosophy and metaphysics - where it becomes about painting a picture that joins the dots, but which can never be tested in its details. This is basically what string theory does.

I think the phrase "far-fetched" has to be put aside when discussing this sort of thing! :-)

> And I agree, this is more meta-physics/phylosophical than true science so I prefer to refrain from judging it because I don't think I'm qualified to do so.

I don't think anyone is. :-) All we can really do is come up with different ways of thinking about it, which might turn out to be useful, and be open to taking ideas from here and there.

The way I think of it, all scientific theories are "applied metaphors". What varies is the number of "contact points" there are between the metaphor and easily-shared subjective observation.

- If there are lots of contact points and they're easily accessed, it becomes a proven scientific theory, an objective fact.
- If there are very few contact points but they're easily accessed, it might become an established philosophical position, a useful "way of thinking".
- If there are very few contact points and they're not easily accessed, it becomes a metaphysical view or it becomes a hand-waving description without details. (EDIT: 'Mystical' or religious knowledge falls in to this maybe?)
- Below that and there's no theory, just subjective experience and anecdotes. (EDIT: Glitches, mostly, so far.)

Science deals best with "easily observed regularities" which are very simply connected with sensory experience (because we *think* in "shadow experiences").

This stuff is difficult (assuming the reports are correct). You can't observe what someone is doing in this case *and* you can't observe what is happening. Any theory here is going to be a metaphor which is big on description, small on contact points!

Anyway, interesting to explore this stuff regardless.

[...]

> lol i cant tell if you're serious or not

It's from a genuine paper by the US Air Force Research Laboratory. Whether you believe the Chinese accounts is another thing, but the US survey paper does exist (see my other comment). Even if it's nonsense, it's interesting/amusing that they took the time to investigate the nonsense and theorise about it, "just in case".

> [Q: There have been other stories of people finding things as well. There was that one story about the stuffed bear in the closet materializing after a family dinner/discussion. I had been thinking about it in terms of quantum reality shifting, but maybe it was a case of group p-teleportation. This sub gets so out-there sometimes. I love it.]

They would be the same thing, just more specific? Changing "the fact of something's location" vs changing a larger set of facts?

[...]

> wait, what? Chinese children have been stealing my socks and bread ties via teleportation?!?

Yes. They need the bread ties to help keep those big socks up.

Reply to “I Got My Cat Back, But at What Cost?”

[[OP:I posted this at /r/dimensionaljumping but the sidebar says that maybe it's better suited for this sub or maybe /r/yourelosingyourfuckingmind

Anyway, here goes nothing

I either unintentionally jumped dimesions or I'm going bat-shit insane. My cat Alvin died in September. He'd had a benign tumor growth in his abdomen area and I'd taken him into the vet to get it removed. It turned out to go deeper than they anticipated and due to complications from the procedure and the fact that he was 13 years old he died in surgery. This fucking wrecked me emotionally. I was very close with my cat. I live alone and we were kind of a slacker dream team duo. I insisted I get his body back so I could bury it at home and had dug him a lovely spot under a big oak tree on my land. I spent weeks just barely functioning, mourning the loss of my best friend. In fact I'd just recently gotten to the point where I could sleep through the night again without waking up in tears.

Now imagine my utter shock when I woke up two days ago and Alvin was curled up at my feet above my covers. after I double checked to make sure I wasn't dreaming or that another cat hadn't gotten inside some how i fucking broke down sobbing beside him. It's him I'm 100% certain. Only he has a scar along the side of his neck that looks like it may be from a recent (within the last few months) surgery. His grave is also gone now without a trace. I've not yet mentioned anything about this to my friends or family for fear of sounding insane, and I've not noticed any other differences in my life.

Something did occur to me today, though. If I did jump, does that mean I displaced a version of me that woke up two days ago to discover that his best friend has been dead for a month? If that's the case I can't imagine how horrible that would be. At least when Alvin died for me I had already come to grips with that small possibility before he went in for surgery. I can't imagine just having the rug pulled out from me like that. Thinking about that possibility makes me really feel like shit, and a little like I don't deserve this second chance. I'd almost rather be going crazy. What do you guys think? I'd urge anyone who's trying to intentionally jump dimensions (like over at /r/dimensionaljumping) to think about what you're potentially taking away from the other you.]]

[...]

> Q1: where is OP with replies?

> Q2: exactly, i'm not buying this one, i think it's an advertisement for dimentionjumping or whatever they said.

It's not; it was posted there first and then here. I suppose OP might have, like, a job to go to or something...

> Q2: i still don't buy it.

Even pretenders usually engage in a bit of conversation below the line though, don't they? Otherwise what's the point?

> Q2: some don't engage bc they would have to show pics or give more detail.

Yeah, it just seems like a waste of time though - what do you (they) get out of it?

> Q2: i don't know, i've seen lot's of people called out for making up stories, some of them like the attention and i think some are just mentally ill and actually believe what they are writing. so idk.

Yeah, I think you have to *be* that person to understand it.

Personally, I take the attitude of not "believing" in anything, I just find things interesting or not, useful or not. It's only if I have to make a decision based on it, that I need to make the call. And even then, it's more about probability of result, rather than believing something is "true".

If posters are obviously trolling or creative-writing, then they get zapped. Otherwise, we let the subscribers decide for themselves. Thing is, strange things *do* happen (at least in the sense of the person having no logical explanation for it), so inventing a story often isn't getting one over on anyone; you've just made yourself feel clever, briefly, to no great benefit.

[...]

> Q3: It does not seem to work like that. More than likely, you died, and your consciousness shifted to a nearby reality where you did not die, much as Alvin did not die. You might note quite a bit of minor discrepancies. Certainly. no-one around you is going to remember you mourning for Alvin since Alvin never died. The reality shift may not have happened as a result of you dying, either. Pocket realities are in the process of being lined up and merging in order for them to stabilize. This is a merged reality, rather than an entirely different one.

This seems awfully complicated... How exactly do we know that there are various realities, and that they are merging and so on, when we can't get "outside" of them to see this happen? Isn't that just the unfalsifiable many-worlds hypothesis all over again? Assuming people's stories are correct, all we know is that their ongoing experience of the world suddenly shifted *vs* their memory of it. Everything beyond that is just imagination and conjecture, right?

What I am - well, not disputing exactly, but exploring - is your interpretation of experiences. "Timestreams", "realities", even "space-time continuums" and suchlike are abstract concepts which are not experienced as such. What *is* experienced is something not being as you expect it: a situation not being how you remember, or, occasionally, witnessing a change. Everything after that is, surely, philosophy and metaphysics? Nothing wrong with that; but such things are conceptual frameworks which are not *true*; they are *useful*.

The very idea that a "space-time continuum" is "healing/being fixed" seems to me to be an interpretation from nowhere. It might "explain" but only in the sense of being a *description*; it's is not a *truth*. I've never seen a space-time continuum, but assuming there is such a thing, I don't see why it would need healed for or by anyone. Do you see where I"m coming from?

Broadly, I'd suggest: the only thing that is *true* is our direct observation. Everything beyond that is a connective fiction, a narrative. The further we move from being able to tie our narrative to an observation, the more we drift into ungrounded interpretation - as in, one of many interpretations, selected on preference rather than accuracy.

> Because we simply don't know what is true, it may be best to keep all ideas on the table until they can be proven incorrect.

That's actually what I was getting at.

Basically, given the *actual observed content* of experiencing such a "shift", there are always multiple ways of describing it - several different conceptual frameworks we could use to construct an interpretation. We build a description from ideas, but any ideas which can never actually be experienced, are just that: mental constructs.

It's perhaps similar to the situation we have with the common interpretations of quantum mechanics: there's nothing really to choose between them except individual preference - because they all predict the same observations. "Many-worlds", for instance, is really just a fanciful imagining of what lies behind a mathematical theory, a theory which only makes a prediction of an outcome, and doesn't actually say what happens to produce that outcome.

So - when we talk of "time-streams" and "merging realities" of multiple worlds, we're engaging in philosophy. We might equally formulate a description in terms of the instability of patterns in extended minds, and have it match the observations identically. There'd be nothing to choose between the two, except personal preference. So I was curious about /u/alanwescoat's certainty in his description. Was it simply that it's easier to speak as if your current favourite framework is how it really is (I do exactly the same thing; it makes discussion simpler), or does he actually think that is what is definitely happening? And if so, what's led him to choose that particular interpretation over another?

[...]

And this topic gets right to the heart of the whole glitches thing, I think. As for "truth", I generally split it into two categories at the moment:

- There's *Conceptual Truth*, which is having a description which is self-consistent and matches the observations. This doesn't mean it was "what is really happening", but it provides a way to connect different experiences together and think about them.
- There's *Direct Truth*, which is the actual sensory content of an observation, before it's been abstracted. (Note, a thought is itself also a direct experience, but only of a thought, as a "shadow-sensory" observation, not of something outside of that which it is "about".)

The hardness of the floor under your feet is directly true, for instance. Meanwhile, you might develop a theory about "hardness" based on your observations. There are probably thousands of ways you could put together that theory - so none of them would be "the" truth, they would just be *relatively* true within themselves. Only the direct experience of the floor would be *fundamentally* true.

So for glitches: the actual weird experience = direct truth. The description or interpretation of that experience = conceptual truth.

There's some overlap of course, because your experiences are to some extent "patterned" by concepts which arise with it, but it's quite a useful division for checking what percentage of your worldview is imagined fantasy. Let's see if our reality-blending friend has any thoughts on the matter...

[...]

Many-worlds and friends is definitely a nice "thinking framework" and - although it is not scientific in my opinion (I'm full of opinions aren't I?) - I think it can help people a lot, because it's a way of having people realise an important philosophical point: that the form of the universe (whatever that is) is not necessarily of the same as the form of your everyday perception.

In other words, 3D-space and time are *part of your experience*, they are not the format of how things are "happening" when you aren't experiencing them. The world is maybe more like a dimensionless gloop of facts which can be called up. The room next door is not actually "over there"; it is actually sort of "dissolved" into the background *right here and now*.

Once you've got a feel for that concept, and have recognised the hidden assumption you have been making, then your perspective on an awful lot of things can change quite dramatically.

Reply to “I think God may have finally reached out to me.”

Stepping back for a moment, it might be worthwhile separating out the experience from the explanation. Obviously there's the "it's just a coincidence" explanation, but let's ignore that for the moment...

Putting that aside, what definitely happened is that you requested an experience of "knowing that someone is out there looking for you", and then subsequently had such an experience. That's the *content* of the experience. The *nature* of that experience, is still up for grabs.

You can interpret this as an "Entity God" or something else listening to you and sending you a message - but equally you could interpret it as an *an intention* (from the desire to experience knowing something) followed by *a result* (the experience of knowing). If you'd asked for the experience of knowing that the devil was taunting you, or knowing that the NSA was hunting you, the corresponding evidence for *those* might have arisen, as requested. On the one hand that might seem a bit disheartening - on the other hand it means you have deliberately created a glitch-like experience for yourself, via intention!

Playfulness aside though, you should just go with whatever explanation feels most useful to you (you can always change your mind later). In lonely and lost times, little glimmers of inspiration can make all the difference, and you should let them work their magic when they appear. Glitch or God, **who cares so long as it's helpful?**

[...]

> Q1: I consider this a delusion, but if it helps you find hope, then it is well worth it.
>
> > A1: It's interesting how this subreddit completely accepts the idea of "slipping temporarily between dimensions", or going through a temporary form of time travel randomly, but someone saying that an explanation could be God, or reaching out to God is delusional. I'm not saying you have to be religious, but come on.
> >
> > > Q1: Am I not allowed a personal opinion? I believe the concept of a god is a mental delusion. That doesn't mean it doesn't help some people with their interactions with reality. I'm of the mindset that if a god exists, he can't convince me of his/her/its existence without forcing my mind to believe it. That doesn't mean that I don't believe that odd, unexplainable things happen. I just find that relying on a god for the explanation immediately hinders further, actual research.

The *concept* of a god can't be a delusion surely; it depends more on what that concept represents. I agree that stopping further investigation due to that (or any) concept is a missed opportunity though. It's the equivalent of saying "just... *because*".

> > It's not my cup of tea, but I still drink from time to time.

I like that angle. I'm inclined to think that *all* conceptualisation is "delusional" thinking, *if it is seen as being identical to what is actually happening*. So long as you recognise thoughts as being what they are (thoughts), and your explanations as "connective fictions" to link observations together, all is well. As soon as you start thinking that it was "God" that really did it, or that "Gravity" is a real thing that somehow "causes" objects to move towards each other, you are being delusional.

Of course, forgetting that "Gravity" is a just a conceptual framework (albeit a very useful one) isn't nearly as likely to cause you problems in daily life as other things are - particularly because the raw observation "people who fall from high places tend to die horribly" is pretty persuasive all on its own when it comes to decision-making. So some types of delusional thinking cause less trouble than others. An open mind, though, hopefully recognises their fictional nature and is always accepting of other, better descriptions when they come along.

Yeah, so, explanations and descriptions are useful or not, they are never "true" - thinking they are is delusional.

> so how would i go about 'forgetting' gravity and forgetting that i can't teleport anywhere of my choosing or materialize objects etc?

That's certainly an interesting question which raises all sorts of fascinating philosophical issues.

> again, none of it matters because clearly whatever i think and do is wrong, otherwise i wouldn't be experiencing life...

What is your reasoning for that conclusion?

Actions themselves don't accomplish anything, if all you intend is the experience of doing the action. And if you instead intend a desired state, you have to get out of the way and let movements arise without opposition as experience unfolds towards that state - basically "be okay with whatever happens" - because you can't know in advance what the connective is experience is going to be. (You can't "pre-experience" an experience, otherwise it would *be* the experience.)

This is good and bad. One the one hand, it means you must have "faith" that things are going appropriately, even though you cannot conceive of how that is so. That can be uncomfortable, because it requires that you are okay with "being moved" rather than being in moment-to-moment control. On the other, it means you don't need to bother "working things out" because it has no bearing on the actual outcome - the causal link between apparent actions and outcomes is illusory, only intention (or the *assigned meaning* of an act) matters.

So eventually, the idea is that you recognise that you always give up in the end, often through despair and exhaustion, so why not just give up at the start instead?

There are two things we're talking about here I think: a) non-doing, b) changing state. Excuse the slight rambling:

a) Non-doing is *ceasing to interfere*; it's not something you *do* at all. And when you cease interfering, your experiences will play out spontaneously from your current state. It's like having ripples in a pool of water, and stopping splashing or countering the direction of the already-established wave pattern. In this context, we can view desire as the temporary state of resistance that prevents "over here" unfolding to "over there" - it's like constant intending to prevent of the movement of the waves via holding on. When you cease interfering, then desire will fade, as the state shifts to accommodate it, as the desire pattern becomes integrated into the overall wave pattern. There are no guarantees about the form in which it will arise as an experience, or when, since it will be incorporated into whatever other structure or "facts' make up your current state.

b) Changing state is how you actually modify the patterns directly. You do this simply by intention - which means holding an *unbounded thought* in mind, rather than a thought *about* it. However, the more established the pattern, the longer you will have to hold that intentional pattern in mind, and the more foundational a

pattern, the more involved this is. Having done this, you will have shifted your state, and your subsequent experiences will therefore automatically be in line with this.

So to just clarify - "Non-doing" means not interfering with the experiences arising from your current state. It doesn't mean experiences stop, and it doesn't mean that intentions necessarily instantly have effect, because you have deep patterning already present. Having said that, the longer you remain as a non-doer, the longer you have ceased to reinforce or re-trigger existing patterns, the more flexible and responsive things become.

Additional thought - What you "desire" isn't always the same as what you "want" as apparently described by passing thoughts.

Reply to “A theory about us and our potential”

> [OP: Well,like a mont ago i was thinking about god(im atheist), i always try to find a explanation of god with logic and science, but things changed since i know this sub and all the stories of glitches, now i know there is no logical explanation for some things, yet. I was thinking ans like a shock i just got like a message from my head,like something that i knew that was truth, and it was this: in the bible, jesus said something like "you can believe in what you want, it doesnt matter what is it, it can be a stone,anything, i will be in that stone" so i got it, it was just a way to represent this:
>
> God is the omnipotent force that created everything, and he made us equal to him, so that mean we can create our own world,we are actually gods, and jesus, is just the power of believing, is not a guy. that means that the power of being god cames from believing in ourselves, believing we can do anything we want, we caba fly,we can glitch.
>
> I think thats the final answer to god,it has a lot of sense. sorry if i have some mistakes in spelling or grammar, im from argentina,and im 14 Thats all,thanks for reading :)
>
> EDIT 2: I did some research about where did that quote came from and is from the "Gospel of Thomas" is not in the bible, but that doesnt mean the quote is false]

Well, maybe...!

Good quote. It fits in with the "God = imagination as consciousness taking on the shape of the world" concept from the other discussion too. It's basically nondualism with a twist. So, logic and science begin with what is observed, and create and leverage abstractions (concepts and relationships) to link the observations together into useful stories. The observations dictate the possible stories; the stories do not dictate the possible observations. (Although if we get into a bad habit of reifying our abstractions, we might *think* that they do.)

That means the presence or lack of a logical explanation does not mean anything regarding what is "really happening"; it is an *explanatory fiction*. (See recent Delayed Choice Experiment results and QBism's interpretation for related ideas emphasising this.)

In this view then, you are consciousness taking on the shape of a *being-a-person-in-a-world* experience. You are literally everything that you experience. However, this means the world is no longer the "spatially-extended place unfolding in time" that you may have previously assumed it to be.

Now you just have to work out what a "belief" is *exactly*, and how it's changed, and do some experiments, I guess...

EDIT: Just noticed your age. Nice work. Someone else posted a link to this Neville Goddard archive. He had the same idea as you, it just took him an extra 30 years to get there.

I was just being encouraging really - hence links to a physicist imploring us not to take our abstractions too seriously, and a QM interpretation based on "private views" which is a more robust way of thinking about these ideas. My own 14-year-old self was well into a mix of physics, philosophy, the mind and the esoteric, plus relentless theorising about the nature of reality and how to leverage knowledge. So I know how it is when you're fascinated by that stuff. Although interestingly some of the concepts in those early books still shape how I think about processes even now.

[...]

> [Q: ‘jesus said something like "you can believe in what you want, it doesnt matter what is it, it can be a stone,anything, i will be in that stone"’
>
> Sorry, that's not in the Bible. What Jesus said was, "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life, no one comes to the Father except through me."]

I like the stones one better though. Although eternal life *as* a stone doesn't sound very appealing.

[...]

I dunno - I think the process by which the early church selected the books was probably not based on accuracy and truth, so much as alignment with the church's preferred message. *Thomas* is a bit Gnostic/Buddhist and doesn't really fit the Entity God line of thinking.

Since it consists of "sayings" rather than narrative, and predates the canonical books, it could well be more accurate in terms of its message than the story-books. But does it matter? If people derive valuable insight from it, all to the good.

EDIT: You can see how passages like this might not have been church-friendly:

> *Jesus said,* "If those who lead you say, 'See, the Kingdom is in the sky,' then the birds of the sky will precede you. If they say to you, 'It is in the sea,' then the fish will precede you. Rather, the Kingdom is inside of you, and it is outside of you. When you come to know yourselves, then you will become known, and you will realize that it is you who are the sons of the living Father. But if you will not know yourselves, you dwell in poverty and it is you who are that poverty."
>
> -- *The Gospel of Thomas*

Basically, this says you don't need to bow to anyone or any organisation, **you are your own power**.

> > [See it] as another reaction to the same Jesus that Mark etc. were writing about.

Yes, this seems like a good way to view it. More recently, we have multiple and really very different interpretations of the philosophy of Immanuel Kant, each having "their Kant" and building on it, and that's only 200 or so years ago! So of course the same likely applies here.

Those who saw "God" as being a literal entity, selected and developed and edited their writings accordingly. Those who saw it as being a metaphor for the nature of reality and transformation, similarly. This isn't necessarily a dubious thing, people see whatever they come to it with. What's interesting, though, is that the same passages support often both interpretations! (Although one is usually more fun.)

EDIT: When I said "it could well be more accurate in terms of its message" I meant that writing things in terms of narrative might inherently involve more "shaping" than just compiling a collection of sayings.

[...]

I guess: Everything is "real" in the sense that it is a real whatever-it-is. What matters though is the *sort* of reality it turns out to be. It may be a dream with very ingrained habits (jumping off dream cliffs leads to the dream of broken legs), but the fact of it being dreamlike at all makes a massive difference.

There may be no way out of *experiencing* completely, but having more of an insight might help us get out of certain *experiences*, have more desirable ones, right?

Reply to “Raining on me inside”

UC, you insist on taking *all the magic away...* ;-)

Understandable. Shitty stuff abounds. :-/

You can't escape from anything though, escaping implies existence and perpetuates things (in my experience). The rule turns out to be: no-one ever wins a fight, you have to turn away and forgive (=forget without trace). Very Biblical. All we can do is assert a *new* experience and open up to it.

Today the Owls Of Eternity, tomorrow the world! ;-)

On eyesight - now this is for something different but maybe it could help a bit indirectly - after years of mucking around with exercises and the Bates method and so on for variable short-sightedness, I realised that if I instead "sat back" in my head and "let the world come to me" suddenly my vision (or actually *perception*) was transformed.

Reply to “A drive to the grand canyon changed my life when an interesting coincidence was followed by a profound realization. then things got weird.”

> [[OP: I was riding shotgun and poring over my latest book, "zen and the art of motorcycle maintenance." we were heading north out of phoenix and had about 6 hours of driving ahead of us. my eyes seldom left the pages.
>
> about an hour into the trip, I saw an object in my peripheral vision and involuntarily flicked my eyes at it. it was mile marker 222. I had the thought, "that's a cool number." back to the book...
>
> several hours go by and by this time we had gotten onto another highway heading west. it was dark and becoming even easier to immerse myself in the task of reading. another unexpected flick of my eyes landed once again on a mile marker. 222 zipped by for the second time. "holy shit that's a strange coincidence," I thought.
>
> after a couple more hours we had reached our hotel. I continued to read as I laid in bed, and within a short time came to a passage that literally made my heart race. no reading experience had ever produced such a physical reaction.
>
> the passage said, in short, if you want to better understand the way the world sees you and get a sense of the way with which you impact your surroundings, analyze your interpretations. if I look at a man with a sour look on his face and see jealousy, that is very possibly a projection of my own feelings. another person may see disappointment. while another may see disgust. these differences say more about the observer than the object.
>
> the notion that I could learn to see myself from a more objective point of view was exactly what I needed and shook me to the core. I was blown away. "what page am I on? this is important and I cannot forget it." my eyes nearly left my face when number 222 was staring back at me.
>
> I felt at peace in a way that had since eluded me. I closed the book and drifted off to sleep. I don't understand the significance of 222, but the lesson on perspective has never left me and I am a better man for it.
>
> edit: it may have been a bit less than 6 hours. I was estimating. so I decided to check the distance out of curiosity. now that's coincidence and confirmation bias!]]

It's definitely, literally, coincidence.

I'm not sure confirmation bias quite works as an explanation for things as they unfold - as in, how exactly does it account for it? - since it's more appropriate to belief-filtered observation and selective memory. Other than that it's a bit of a catch-all "non-explanation" for a variety of different effects.

How could we distinguish between actual event clustering and cognitive bias in such cases? I suggest: we probably can't.

If we take the story as described though, then the significance of 222 developed over time, rather than being a retrospective review pattern-match. We're having to hypothesise additional unremembered observations here, in our search for an "explanation".

It's surely easier to say there was simply a cluster of observation events with identical content. There's no "explanation" for it; it's simply so. If one of the events has personal meaning, then it becomes a story. Otherwise it remains one of those coincidental sequences.

(There might be something to the idea that our apparent personal histories are continually revised in the present moment, but that's pretty much impossible to gather evidence for. The result is the same; it's just another explanatory fiction after the fact.)

> If he "discarded" something, it's not going to be brought up in his retelling.

We either have to trust OP's reporting, or not I suppose. We can *imagine* that maybe he discarded things, but that seems to be inventing something without evidence, just to deny a claim that someone saw "222" three times in a row without seeing other numbers between times. In fact, this whole notion of on-the-fly "discarding" seems more unlikely and far-fetched than just seeing the numbers three times (in this particular case). It's a good thing to clarify though, which OP does here:

> *"The first time I looked up, I saw the first mile marker. the second time I looked up, I saw the second mile marker. I didn't say it explicitly, but I probably should have. the third 222 was wholly unexpected. it sounds like bologna, but that's how it happened."*

It's more the meaningfulness aspect that made it noteworthy I reckon.

> This all probably is coincidence, but saying it's "literally/definitely" coincidence is unfounded.

I say "literally" coincidence because the word often gets used with an implied "just". It definitely is coincidence (several events coinciding within a timeframe) but it's not necessarily "just" coincidence. That's why "synchronicity" was invented, mind you. EDIT: The observations might not cause each other, but there may be a common cause or larger pattern.

> I don't think we're gonna see middle ground here, but i also wont bite my tongue.

Well, we might still get something out of it, a new perspective, so it's worth still digging a bit more. We could probably say it a lot simpler, maybe? Let's just call it "**noticing**".

- "**Noticing**" is the coinciding of your attention being in one place at the moment an event occurs in that place.

In this case, mile-markers are passing all the time, and your attention is only "pulled" towards them at certain times. Those certain times are the times where it was showing "222". It's not that you are looking and discarding (which would be an act, as you said) - you genuinely aren't seeing the markers that aren't "222". So that isn't confirmation bias, but it is "something".

What it might be though, is something that links in with synchronicity. That in some way you are pattern-searching, pre-filtering experience, such that your "looking" is timed with the appearance of those patterns. *Playing with this idea a bit more...*

Noticing: Attention & Events

In the same way as our attention tends to be narrowed down spatially but a movement in the room will "pull it over" to that area of space - perhaps our attention is narrowed temporally, but can be "pulled over" to areas in time also. So if I have in mind "222" then not only will my attention be drawn to the appearance of "222" in static space (noticing "222"-related imagery in the environment) but it will also end up being drawn to "222" in time: I will end up in circumstances where "222" is occurring. In other words, it's not that I am subconsciously aware of "222" in the corner of my eye and then my attention snaps to it. It's more general than that. Rather, it's that my mind is selecting "222-related experiences" from the soup of all possible events, one of which is "looking at a mile-marker with 222" and another is "noticing a cool quote on page 222 of my book".

> The definition of confirmation bias "is tendency to search for, interpret, or recall information in a way that confirms one's beliefs"

Yes, the problem with this definition is that by itself it doesn't define the phenomenon very well. The "222" example of OP isn't so great for exploring this, since they claim to have *only* looked at "222" signs.

> But isn't that confirmation bias, "my mind is selecting 222 related experiences"

Well it can't be that exactly, unless we either limit ourselves to retrospective confirmation or situations where we already know the meaningfulness of the pattern. For the OP story we'd have to be willing to expand a little what is meant by the mind and the information it has access to.

So we'll tweak it a bit for each case. And in each case I'm going to get broader and experimental in an attempt to explain the OP story, just push it and see how far we can go:

Version 1: Retrospective Filtering

If we start with a version that doesn't presume anything about the subconscious and attention and so on, about which we can say nothing (we can't talking about something that isn't observed):

- Given a set of observations, there can be a tendency in retrospect to give prominence to those which support a particular theory.

So this is "confirmation bias" by review. The implication here is that we *see* the observations, but the story we later tell *about* the observations is shaped by our beliefs. We don't really need to propose a mechanism here; it's just good old unwittingly cherry-picking the evidence!

In this example we have been *actually* seeing lots of mile-marker signs with different numbers. However when we notice the Important Book Page is numbered 222, we selectively recall the signs with 222 as being significant.

Version 2: Corner-Of-Eye Attention Pulling

A second version moves away from what I'd call "confirmation bias" and toward "pattern-finding" - and involves attention (this is the "noticing"). But it still fits the general definition provided you already know in advance what pattern you are supposed to be looking for.

- Given a spatial environment, our attention will be drawn to areas in space in which our pattern appears.

- The implication here is that our minds are aware of the *whole* spatial environment (e.g. the entire room) and it directs our attention to the relevant *part* of the room.

In this example although our *minds* are aware of all the mile-marker signs by "seeing out of the corner of our eye", our *attention* only sees those with "222" on them. And then when we read the Important Book Page we also note that it is "222" and go wow.

Although this doesn't explain why OP's attention "knew" that "222" was going to be important before it encountered the book page (remember, they only saw signs with "222" from the start).

Version 2b: Corner-Of-Space Attention Pulling

The next version of this broadens things out more and seems to get more esoteric, but really it's just expanding the spatial principle.

- Instead of "seeing out the corner of our eye" we suggest that our broader minds are actually sensing the larger environment.
- Given a spatial environment, our attention will be drawn to areas in space *at the exact time* in which our pattern appears.

This explanation is close to Version 2 except that it explains why we coincidentally look up at the exact moment the mile-marker sign passes by. We are not just filtering what's going in our eye; we are actually filtering the environment and our possible actions such that we experience the pattern.

This explanation works a little better than the previous one (we don't to remotely pretend we are discarding things) but it still doesn't quite account for the "222" in the book and the fact that the book page is what makes that number relevant...

Version 3: Global-Landscape Attention Pulling

In this version we go all out on the pattern-matching idea by throwing away the temporal restriction.

- Given a spatiotemporal environment, our attention will be drawn to areas in space and time in which our pattern appears.
- The implication here is that our minds are aware of the *whole* environment of time and space (e.g. the entire world over all time) and it directs our attention to the relevant *parts* of the world over all time. Like a landscape with all available observations, filtering it down to ones that match out pattern.

In this explanation, the fact that the Important Book Page is numbered "222" is the source of the pattern of experiences relating to "222". Although our attention encounters the book page last of all, our minds have seen the whole pattern and have in effect selected the whole sequence via pattern-matching from a timeless perspective.

This explanation needs a lot of back up (e.g. experiential moments co-existing as a configuration space of "Nows" like Julian Barbour's *The End of Time*), but it allows that the two mile-marker signs and the book page number are part of the same selection process. The fact of the Important Book Page being numbered 222 is the filter that is applied across the whole journey. The Important Book Page *caused* the looking-up-at-the-right-moment to see the mile-markers.

This is a potential framework for understanding synchronicity in general, but it comes with the penalty of having to see "time" as the scanning of attention across a static event landscape, rather than something that "passes".

And now just for silly fun...

Version 4: Dynamic History; Observation Accumulation

A way to combine the first version with all the others - but retain "passing time" - is to say that OP's experience was being dynamically updated as it unfolded. In other words, their "past" was being constantly revised as new observations arrived, *or* their observations were taking as input the previous observations:

- OP did not in fact see two mile-markers with "222" and then see the Important Book Page with "222". They saw the book page and then the mile-markers became the same number in their mind. Their apparent past was adjusted *at that moment* to correspond to the book page.
- Or more ambitiously, since OP had never observed the book page before, it was indeterminate until she looked at it (like the John Wheeler "Delayed Choice Experiment"). Since "222" was the current pattern in her mind, that became part of the observation of the book page, essentially "fixing" it as "222".

I'm not necessarily recommending this one...

> Thank you for going into such detail. This is amazing. Where can i read more about this? What area of study is this?

Well, I mostly just make this stuff up. ;-)

However, the foundations of it are in ideas about perception and the nature of the world, metaphysics and philosophy. Building on things like George Berkeley's *Three Dialogues* (recommended), Immanuel Kant and his ideas on phenomenal and noumenal, David Bohm's *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*, Julian Barbour's *The End of Time* - philosophical idealism and nonduality in general. For an angle more specific to subjective idealism, the partial reading list over at /r/Oneirosophy is worth a look.

More on Versions 1-3

Version 1 & 2a are both the "standard view" of how these things work, but as we notice it doesn't *really* quite explain many of the reported experiences, because we have to imagine that minds are doing things that we don't notice, our eyes are seeing things that we don't notice, without really having a mechanism to explain this.

Version 2b and 3: Yes, I agree these are part of the same idea, I just labelled them incorrectly.

If you allow *2b* then you have really allowed *3*, because the explanation which justifies *2b* extends and flips our notion of conscious awareness ("mind") and the world. A shift in attention over time or space is just a shift in the content of experience. Without getting too deeply into this...

This flip involves paying attention to the actual nature of our experience, which I suggest is: A "wide open aware perceptual space" in which our experiences arise (sensations, perceptions, thoughts). This means that we "tune into" our experiences, rather than be "inside" them. The whole world is sort of "dissolved" into the background, spacelessly and timelessly, and we are just shifting our attention to different parts of it, or having

parts of it "triggered into the senses". In this way, I don't really "do" any of my actions - rather, I have the "experience of doing an action".

How does this work and how does this explain synchronicity?

Well, say I begin the day by thinking about "222", which amounts to a desire to experience more "222" in my life. From that moment on, I have basically selected a path of experience which has more "222" in it. The "experience of looking up just as a sign with 222 on it passes" will arise, and the "experience of loving a passage on page 222 of a book" will arise.

It's as if by making the implicit decision to experience more "222" I have defined a trajectory through all the possible moments that might have arisen in my perception that day.

More on Version 4

Version 4 actually relies upon the same flip-around. The experience of a world appears within us, we are not in the world. We can describe it fairly simply:

- What we call the world is actually a single interconnected "world-pattern" which only exists *now*.
- What we call our present moment experience is just the brightest or more activated patterns in the "world-pattern", and this activation pattern continually shifts. It's like the sun in the daytime sky: the background stars are still there, they are just obscured. The shifting sensory experience is like different stars having their turn being "the sun in the sky".
- What we call the "past" is just a section of the world-pattern that exists *now*. When we recall the past, we are really just triggering into relative brightness the part of the world-pattern we call "what happened".

Key points on the behaviour of the world-pattern:

- *The Law of Coherence:* The *only* rule is that the world-pattern must remain self-consistent. It is a single pattern and so must always be coherent or "make sense" within itself.
- *Observation Accumulation:* Each experience of the world-pattern is creation-by-implication: facts become "fixed" by the experiencing of them. New observations always appear consistent with previous observations. *However*, it is possible that the world-pattern may in certain cases become updated by some sort of "intention" or unusually meaningful event...
- If a part of the world-pattern is updated, then the whole world-pattern will shift to accommodate the change (just due to it all being one pattern) - ensuring it still makes sense.
- After a shift, there may be no trace of the former state of the world-pattern. Since the world-pattern is all that exists, there is nowhere for a memory of it's previous state to be stored.

So this provides us with a way of looking at OP's experience, just as you noted! The key thing is to remember that even when OP remembers the past, *that experience is actually a present-moment observation of the world-pattern*.

So the sequence of experiences is:

- OP has a journey and maybe sees mile-markers and so on.
- OP reads the amazing passage in the book and feels a sense of deep meaning.

- OP looks down and sees it is page 222. *(pattern shift? defining observation?)*
- OP then has an experience ("re-membering") of the mile-markers having been 222.
- At this point it is now *actually true* that the book page was 222 and the mile-markers were 222.

This is not just OP's memory, it is the world-pattern itself which has been dynamically shifting. In other words, if OP subsequently goes looking for evidence that the mile-markers were 222 at the appropriate points, she will discover it is true.

- It is true *now* that the mile-markers were 222 *then*. However:
- It might have been true *previously* that the mile-makers were something else *then*.

The self-consistency rule means that if a shift occurs, all subsequent observations of the world-pattern will corroborate the new state. This is why "glitches" never leave any physical evidence (i.e. evidence that can subsequently be experienced) except the memory of the observer. In fact, the presence of an inconsistent memory in the observer *is* the glitch in most of these stories, in terms of how the world works.

Reply to “It was never plugged in”

> [OP: So today I just bought a new alarm clock and I wanted to test it out. So I have one outlet that I know of that is behind my bed with my old alarm clock (which doubles as a radio) and my phone charger. I have a lamp next to my bed that I always use before I go to bed or when I wake up in the night because the main light switch is on the other side of the room. Anyway I decide I am going to find the outlet that the lamp is plugged into to use that one. Now I used that lamp last night and I know I used it for the past few months. I look down at the base of the lamp and I follow the cable. When I get to the end I find a dust covered cable with no outlet around it and it is just laying out on the floor. I mean the nearest outlet that isn't directly behind my bed is further then the cable would reach. Now I know I used that light but the amount of dust on it looks to be weeks worth like it hasn't been touched or moved. Something so little hasn't freaked me out this much in a long time.]
>
> [Q1: This incident supports the notion in quantum physics that a potential state does not actually come into effect until it is observed. One hypothesis is that the act of observation projects our expectation onto any given phenomenon happening. In other words, at the quantum level, if we expect something to happen, then it will. If you extrapolate this to our world, there are millions of assumptions that we make about the nature of reality on a daily basis that are so ingrained that we don't even question them. What may have happened in this case is that your assumption that the lamp was plugged in was so strong, that you actually willed it into being. In other words, your expectation made it happen. Just a thought.]

This is probably more of a philosophical argument than a scientific one (although the QBism interpretation does promote a sort of subjective view based on expectations). It's really the question: In what sense does an object "happen" if nobody is experiencing it? Or, does an object exist *as an object* when it is not being observed?

Which I guess leads to:

Although our *story* about the light is that it comes from the lamp, and the lamp receives electricity from the socket, in what sense is this actually required for us to experience the light? If only the observation "happens"?

Stories surely don't cause things to happen. So what *does* cause the light to happen?

Also: Do stories "happen" in *any* sense other than when we are thinking about them?

> [Q2: I don't see how it's philosophical. In an objective reality, an effect observed at the quantum level should logically apply to all scales. Unless reality is subjective. To say that a physical property only applies to particles of which everything is comprised, but not to the amalgamation of said particles doesn't make sense.]

My thinking behind that is -

When it comes to experiments targeted at the quantum level, we have no insight as to the *nature* of the effect, only that we get results which correspond to those predicted by a *mathematical* theory. And without having a particular interpretation (one that can be confirmed by experiment) it's not really possible to logically scale it to other situations; there is literally no framework in which to think of it.

However, we can still take on board the notion that our observations *define the state of* what is being observed - we just can't really talk about what is "happening" between observations. We have no theory for it and there's no way to test it scientifically. That's why I say it's more of a philosophical question.

Meanwhile - I'd say that "objective reality" is a pretty tricky concept here. When we start looking at things like the QBism (see link earlier) interpretation of quantum mechanics, it gets a little like philosophical idealism (all that exists is within mind). Rather than being a "place", the so-called objective world becomes more like a "resource", an infinite gloop of possible experiential patterns that our observations select from, thus "fixing" an aspect of our subjective world from that point onwards. (I think of this as *Observation Accumulation*, and the resulting persistence of prior observations as leading to a *Law of Coherence*.)

So we're dealing with a subjective reality (or "private copy") that is experienced, which corresponds to a subset of an objective reality (or "possibility space") which can never be experienced.

Again, since we're talking about an objective reality which *by definition* cannot be experienced other than by subjective observation, and therefore cannot even be thought about (since it is "before" the experience of time and space), I see it as philosophy rather than science. *EDIT: Although at this level we are revealing them to be much the same thing: science = philosophy + observations.*

TL;DR: We can't assume an objective reality that is of the same form as our subjective observations.

Logic Within Imagination

> The best we can do is logically deduce the most likely reasons behind why things seem to be happening.

I think it's better to say, we deduce the most elegant description which fits in with the concepts we have developed so far - rather than being the "reason" or being "likely". This may seem pedantic, but it reminds us that we are creating *connective fictions* to link observations, rather than discovering "what really happens". Bearing this in mind makes it easier to remain detached and revise our models; it also keeps us mindful of the metaphorical nature of our explanations. We are dealing with "applied mental imagery" here, not reality.

Not VR. Not Probability. Not.

> But the basic idea (which we haven't had the ability to comprehend until computers were invented) is that we are living in a 'virtual' reality.

This is slightly the problem, I'd say? It's the problem with our current attitude to theories in general - specifically, their reification into being their own "facts". We are *not* living in a "virtual reality". Nor are we living in a world governed by "probability waves". And so on. These are stories. It's not that we have been living in a virtual reality but we didn't have the ability to comprehend it until now. Rather, it's that until now we could not employ the *metaphor* of virtual realities when thinking about our world, because we didn't have computers and simulators. Basically, it's the modern version of universe-as-clockwork, or universe-as-geometry. (And no, the brain isn't a computer, either.)

Recent Minds, Closed Minds

I think the last 30 years of science has been the most impoverished and close-minded so far. Some of this was perhaps due to the funding crisis of the 1970s where to get finance it was very much required to "take a view" on things which were not actually verifiable (hence the rise of many-worlds and so on). This was okay, but

coupled with the "gee-whiz" approach of popular science publications, scientists became more like technologists than practical philosophers, and a whole generation has grown up fighting about being *right* about reality, rather than being *elegant* about *describing* it.

George Ellis recently made the point that "attempts to exempt speculative theories of the Universe from experimental verification undermine science", while Neils Bohr said: "It is wrong to think that the task of physics is to find out how Nature is. Physics concerns what we say about Nature." I tend to agree.

Fun Is Not Fact

None of this need be a problem necessarily, if we view our descriptions as *useful* or *elegant* or even just *fun*, rather than objectively true. (I'd put the simulation hypothesis and many-worlds in the "fun" category.) I think this is going to be particularly important as we are forced to discard the idea of a literal "objective world" and readmit the idea of "intersubjective agreement", something already happening in interpretations of quantum mechanics.

Nitpicking? Perhaps it might seem so. But I see having the right mindset in place as essential to the healthy development of science, and even the freedom of the individual against the potential tyranny of the favoured theory of the day.

Note - this doesn't stop us enjoying playing with "the cool ideas" and seeing our lives through those lenses, but really: if you can't experience it with your senses, then it is imaginary, even though imagining such things does tend to feed back and "pattern" your experience, in a self-confirming loop of "rightitude".

TL;DR:

We are not living in a virtual reality. But neither are we living in a world made of matter and energy. Supporting observations establish a particular description as being *useful*, not as being *true*.

Additional - My own view is in line with the comments by users Romain and Anthony: "Until there is some experiment (or theory) that can distinguish between these interpretations, the question is one purely of taste, and not of scientific merit."

> Your assertion that "we are not living in a virtual reality" is just as close-minded as anything else.

I mean it in a different way, though. I'm not saying that it's not a virtual reality and that it's something else. I'm saying that all content-based descriptions are "wrong" in the sense that they are relative, not fundamental. You might well be able to have experiences "as if" you are in a virtual reality, but those would be no more fundamental than having experience "as if" you were in a material world made from atoms.

The fundamental truth is the *nature* of the *experiencing itself*, rather than the content of any experience or set of experiences.

> Also there are subjective experiments that can be done in order to verify the true nature of reality.

Right, this is actually where I'm coming from with this...

> In the end the way fundamental reality is percieved is different based upon which metaphors best make sense to us.

I certainly agree with that - although I'm wary of saying "perceived", because perception is content. I do think that most religions were attempts to present, in metaphor and parable form, the way in which the world works - no, *is* - on a *fundamental* level, beyond the specifics. Science has been more focused on the content, which is as it should be; science can't say anything about what Nature *is*, only what it *does*.

> Most are just using different metaphors to describe the same thing. There is only one truth.

Agreed - a truth that can only be experienced, and cannot be put into words.

"Virtual reality" is just today's metaphor to say the same thing: that our sensory experience, now, does not correspond to how the world is actually "stored". It's like Berkeley's "mind of God", or Kant's "noumenal", or Blake's "bright sculptures of Los's Halls", or my own "Infinite Grid of All Possible Moments". Each is a metaphor for The Absolute, which is eternal and unchanging and contains all of creation. The same thing comes up in the Yogic view of consciousness (worth a read, that, for its accessible coverage of van der Leeuw and Taimni).

If reality is a blanket of material, and the folds in it are our experiences (which includes thoughts) - then all these metaphors are folds which are trying to point to the material they are made from. We *are* the blanket, so no fold can ever encapsulate us. However, it might be able to *symbolise* the truth, but this symbol would only make sense as a pointer to a direct experience; it makes no relative sense.

Alternative metaphor: in a sandbox, you can only make sand-shapes which accurately represent, by duplication, other sand-shapes. You cannot make a sand-shape which accurately represents either the sandbox or sand itself.

[...]

> You can't 'extrapolate' quantum physics to the real world, that's not how it works at all. I'd love one of the regular posters from r/science to come explain exactly how retarded you are.

Just to chime in here, since it got all aggressive:

- Let's not call people retards.
- In general, it's good to offer an actual alternative interpretation or information. It's fine to correct someone, that's how everyone learns. But "that's not how it works... I've heard... and you're an idiot" doesn't add anything. Counter-comments should educate.
- If you haven't actually studied the science yourself, second-hand dismissiveness doesn't help. The general science flag-waver who hasn't done his reading is the worst sort of ignorant. He doesn't know anything, but he pontificates because he thinks he knows other people that do.
- Finally, I imagine that the commenter is referring to QBism - which asserts that we have "private views" of the world which are based upon our ongoing subjective expectations - and he is then having a bit of fun with the idea.

Meanwhile, if you're going to talk about "the real world" as if it's somehow distinct from the quantum world, you're probably going to have to back that up with some data.

Note, it's not that I particularly agree with our commenting friend - I don't - but if I were disagreeing with him, I wouldn't be doing it the way you were...

You get downvoted for not defining "the real world"... ;-)

Reply to “Remembering Memories From Other Timelines?”

[OP: I remember waking up one day and not being able to move my legs. I also remember drowning in the pool of my aunt's apartments. No one else involved in these memories remembers them.

1: My dad was trying to wake me up. I was about 8 or so, and told him I couldn't leave the bed because my legs wouldn't move. I tried to move them, but it was like there was a block in between my head and my legs. They wouldn't move. He scooped me up and put me in his truck. We went to a hospital. I'm pretty sure it was Baylor Medical Center in Garland, TX. I recognize the building's unique porch-roof-thing?

Anyway, we were admitted. And I was given a wheelchair to sit in. I remember that in particular because I was having fun figuring out how to turn it by using one wheel and not the other.

Eventually I had x-rays taken of my legs. I remember this very clearly because it was terrifying. The nurse was very kind and my mom was there, but the machinery was very scary. I was cautioned not to move, but since I couldn't move anyway-- That was redundant.

We left the hospital. I spent the rest of the weekend with my dad, and when it was the school week they left me with my grandma. I spent a couple days with her, and then the memory ends.

I'm mentioned this to my mom and my grandma (I no longer speak to my dad and couldn't get in touch with him even if I tried) and neither of them remember this. My mom remembers taking me to the hospital for "something about [my] legs" but can't pin down what happened. It was 17 years ago, though.

2: When I was 12, I was at my aunt's apartment to use her complex's pool (ours didn't have one). My aunt, my mom, and I were all in the pool and we had it to ourselves that day. The pool was made of two rectangles forming a 90 degree angle. One of the rectangles of the pool was slightly smaller than the other. My aunt and mom were in the larger area, talking while floating on those inflatable lounge things. I remember bobbing my head out of the water, trying to get their attention. There was something bothering me, and I was scared but I don't remember what it was. I can't breath enough to yell at them. I mean, looking back I can infer that I was probably drowning. That memory just ends in sort of purple. But, neither my mom nor my aunt remember "that time i nearly drowned."

Theories: I have false memories. I'm remembering things wrong. Or, these things happened to some other version of me, and I have her memories too.]

[Q1: Very interesting. This seems like more of a Mandela Effect sort of thing than a glitch, but it's interesting nonetheless. I'm of the mind that these sorts of memories are the result of the phenomena described by the "quantum immortality" theory. It goes like this: we don't actually experience death. When something happens that kills us, our consciousness shifts into a parallel universe where that thing that killed you didn't happen. This new universe is almost exactly like the other one, it's just that in this one you didn't die.

So using this theory in your case, it would mean that when you were 12 years old you drowned, and died, in your Aunt's pool, but then shifted to the universe you're in now, where this incident never happened, and thus you lived to see another day.

The implication with this theory, though, is that when you shift into the "new" universe where you survive your death, there will be other little things that are different from your "original" universe. Basically, this is because there are no two universes that are exactly the same. In order to "find" a universe where you are still alive, you're consciousness takes the one with a timeline that is most similar to the original. This could explain the other memory inconsistencies of yours. Perhaps in this new universe, where you never drowned and died, there never was an event with your legs; not because this killed you, too, but because that event just isn't included in the timeline where you aren't killed in the swimming pool.]

[Q2: The theory doesn't allow for the millions of seconds that a lfe can produce these extra forward moving life times (times as in multiplying) the billions of people currently in the world. How can a person create a different life time in a different dimension if that persons lifetime is connected to everyone elses lifetimes. How do we account for that?]

Possible answer: **We are each of us completely alone in our own private copy of the world**.

> That's kind of terrifying...

Okay, updated answer: We are each of us an "open consciousness space" which is having an experience of *being-a-world-from-a-person-perspective*. Any better?

> Not really...

Why not? Admittedly, it means you aren't a person; you're just having a "person experience". But it also means you are completely at one with the world because it's all "inside you". Surely you can't be lonely if there is no separation? Isn't that better than being "made from atoms", for instance?

[Q2: It'd mean that all I've ever experienced and everything around me is something only I know, and that no-one else than me is a person the same way as me. On the other hand I have no problem being made of atoms, yes I'm probably just a lump of conscious atoms, but what's the problem in that? So is everyone else. I'd much rather have that I'm sharing the world with other people, and that the world is just as much for them as it is for me, than the world being just for me, and only something that I'm experiencing.]

I see, so you are saying that the preferable situation is to be completely screwed, so long as everyone else is screwed too? ;-)

Surely there's a better deal than martyrdom in multiplicity!

Actually, the implication isn't, in fact, that the world is something only you know. You as a person, that is. But it's very hard to describe, due to limitations of language. It would be something like this:

- Imagine there is a blanket of material.
- Now, imagine that this blanket has no properties, except for something we'll call "awareness".
- When the blanket is flat, the only experience the blanket has is "existing".
- At this point, we introduce *folds* into the blanket.
- Now, the blanket is aware of itself relative to itself. In other words, one "fold" can see another "fold".

So we have this situation:

- The blanket is the only thing that exists. That is what you truly are.
- However, the blanket is experiencing itself being all these folds.
- Your current experience of *being-a-person* corresponds to *apparently* being a fold, while *actually* being everything.
- **This is true of everyone.**

This means that you get to *both* a person interacting with others, but *also* the whole world and everyone in it.

The problem with thinking about this is, that not all the folds are happening at the same time. You and I are not sharing the same time and place, exactly. And that is literally unthinkable. There's potentially a way of describing that which makes sense, but it involves flipping things around a bit.

> Ah, ok, I get it now. Yeah that's not terrifying. I was thinking more like everyone else was only in my imagination

Yeah, it's more like everyone is in or part of *an* imagination.

[...]

> That's a false dilemma.

That's a false interpretation of the thread -- which simply proposes an alternative viewpoint (to the one a couple of levels up) and then explores the implications to see where they lead.

> nobody is saying you are "made from atoms"

I'm sure it's literally the case that people are, in fact. What else are you made from, then, in the standard description of things?

[...]

> I realized it must have been a dream.

Out of curiosity: did you *actually remember* that you had dreamt it, or did you instead *infer that it must have been* a dream due to the lack of a reasonable alternative explanation?

Reply to “My prayer was answered.”

I'm gonna say... synchronicity. Actual synchronicity, which is different to "coincidence". It seems pretty much baked into the universe somehow.

People spend their lives looking for messages from outside entities (God) or for deeper secrets in the world, but I think that's a mistake. It's more accurate to say you are seeing your own mind in action. The truth is, we tend to have experiences that are consistent with the direction we're taking. You might find Kirby Surprise's book, Synchronicity, worth a read.

Short version:

- If you believe something, you are *implying* its existence to your mind, and you will often encounter experiences consistent with your belief as a result.
- So don't "believe" your experiences or your own thinking as being "externally true". They have no inherent meaning except what you attach to them. Just treat them as... more experiences.

Oh and don't worry about "God's purpose", just contemplate your own purpose, which is to say: pay attention to how you feel about things, what you are drawn to, and stay "authentic" by being true to that. **Only *you* can know you**.

[...]

> > I had no doubt I experienced contact with a higher power, which is in essence what I was asking for in the prayer, to show me I was being listened to. What would a better answer be?

Hmm. When you get exactly what you ask for, you should always be a little wary. You might just be giving yourself the answer you want to hear, the experience you're seeking. If you had said, "Oh Faerie King, show me a sign!" and had the voice and the light had gone out, would you have treated that as proof of the Faerie King?

Given the choice: that *you* did it or that *God* did it, which would be the better answer? (Alternative: everyone has a "God aspect" to them.)

Because paranoid and delusional people have exactly the same experience: They ask for signs that they are chosen and special, or evidence that they are being followed by evil organisations... and they get it. People *do* look over at them. Cameras *do* turn in their direction. Their phone *do* gets crackly. Their mail *does* arrive rumpled. But it's not because they are actually chosen/followed. Just: unfortunate synchronicity + the meaning they ascribe to it. So you're right to see this as a "gateway for investigation" rather than being necessarily because of something in particular (a 'higher power' or whatever).

[...]

> > elaborate on synchronicity for me

Kirby's Description

At any moment, given what you know so far, there are a limited set of possibilities of what might happen next. Whatever our minds have been focused on, that's how we select between the probable next-moments.

We *seem* to bend the probabilities to experience what we are focused on - we are drawn to actions which lead to them, thoughts appear which match them.

When he talks of parallel universes, he really means different possible next-moments that you are choosing between. There is no "different you" and nobody is communicating with anyone. Simply by focusing on something, you are selecting experiences which match up.

4D Patterns

So, in the case of your example, you were focused on getting a sign. (Your mind was on that even before you asked: your asking was one of the events that came from it being on your mind.) You were then drawn by a spontaneous thought to look at the light just at the moment it was going to go off. The "asking", the "thought", the "looking" and the "light switching" are events which belong to a single pattern, arising from you focusing on this. Groups of experiences arise together as a result: In your case of anticipating stuff, the thought "this guy" and observation "this guy passing me" are part of the same pattern too. It's like the world is a 4D pattern then you see in 3D slices. It seems like *this* causes *that*, but they are part of the same thing - synchronistic patterns.

But maybe put that aside for now...

Simplified Synchronicity

Sit down quietly and imagine, as if it was actually happening in front of you, an owl. Really imagine it vividly there in front of you for about 5 minutes, with the intention that your life is going to be filled with owls for the next while. Then see what happens.

Reply to “When I wasn't looking for it, I was surrounded by Synchronicity. Now that I'm looking, it's nowhere to be found. (Kind of a long read.)”

I've been playing with this a bit recently. I say: Don't look for "messages" via synchronicity. Synchronicity is basically you experiencing the state of your own mind, via the senses. You might think of it a bit like a mirror - or better, that *your mind is a perceptual filter*. The filter dictates what subset of the extended dimensionless reality will appear in your ongoing 3D sensory moment. So, if you spend 20 minutes today imagining owls, as vividly as you can, as if they were in the room with you... you'll spend the next week encountering lots of owls. It's as if you have created an "owl-shaped hole" in your perceptual filter, and the "infinite light of creation" (or whatever) now shines through it, giving you owl-shaped experiences.

The summary:

- Experiences leave traces which *in-form* subsequent experiences. (Leave shapes on your "perceptual filter".)
- Thoughts also leave traces, as *in-form-ation*, affecting subsequent experiences. (You can use this deliberately.)
- Synchronicity is the name for the experiential patterns which result.

So, not much good for messages since you'll just be seeing what you've been thinking and experiencing, as residual indentations on your filter (although you might get some insight into things you are thinking in the background that you're not aware of).

Better to use the technique deliberately. You might not be into owls, but you are probably into something, something that would make you happier? Deliberately spend some time vividly imagining that, so that you are more likely to encounter/notice it. (It's a kinda magical approach, I suppose.)

EDIT: Note that you can think about more general "facts" rather than just images. Also, sorry to hear about your situation. Hope things turn around. Watch out for those owls. They can be sexy.

Yes, it's much simpler than the other ways I was looking at things.

My poor old Mum is great to experiment on with this stuff (I've already taught her how to win any arm wrestle without effort, and to find hidden chocolate via intuition - yeah, she'll be great at Extreme Easter Sports) and I gave her this metaphor to explain it and get her using it (excuse length, but perhaps others will find it useful):

The Imagination Room

There is a vast room. The floor is transparent, and through it an infinitely bright light shines, completely filling the room with unchanging, unbounded white light.

Suddenly, patterns start to appear on the floor. These patterns filter the light. The patterns accumulate, layer upon layer intertwined, until instead of homogenous light filling the room, the light seems to be holographically redirected by the patterns into the shape of *experiences*, arranged in space, unfolding over time. Experiences which consist of sensations, perceptions and thoughts.

At the centre of the room there are bodily sensations, which you recognise as... you, your body. You decide to centre yourself in the upper part of that region, as if you were "looking out from" there, "being" that bodily experience. At the moment you are simply experiencing, not doing anything. However you notice that every experience that arises slightly deepens the pattern corresponding to it, making it more stable, and more likely to appear again as the light is funnelled into that shape.

Now, you notice something else. If you create a thought, then the image will appear floating in the room - as an experience. Again, the corresponding pattern is deepened. Only this time, you are *creating* the experience and in effect creating a new habit in your world! Even saying a word or a phrase triggers the corresponding associations, so it is not just the simple thought that leaves a deeper pattern, but the whole context of that thought, its history and relationships.

Now, as you walk around today, you will feel the ground beneath your feet - but you will know that under what appears to be the ground is actually the floor of the room, through which the light is shining, being shaped into the experience around you. And every thought or experience you have is shifting the pattern...

Asserting Facts

You can also use it to "assert" new *facts-of-the-world*. I leave it to readers to experiment and take this further - but instead of picturing owls, what if you asserted a fact?

You do this by "feeling it to be true" rather than picturing it, to allow for a more general pattern. For example, "people are always bumping into me on the street". I'm sure you could think of better "facts"...

Those were other examples, pre-room metaphor, but the same basic principle applies. Here's how they work:

- For the arm-wrestling, withdraw your "presence" from your arm so you're not tempted to try to make it happen. "Decide" that you are going to win, feeling the winning position - get out of the way and just wait for it to happen.
- For the chocolate-finding, think of your body like a "shell". Withdraw from it, letting it move as it wants. Command it, "body, go and retrieve the object", and get out of the way. Let your body go as it pleases.

In both cases, you are essentially declaring that something is going to happen - that it really *already has* happened, a "fact" on your timeline - and then staying in a state of "open allowing" to let circumstances unfold without interference.

> Huh, this is really interesting.

And something you can easily experiment with! Particularly the first one. Your body actually always works like this, it's just that you've got into the habit of constantly intending a "posture/position" for it, effectively asserting it stay in a fixed position - so in daily life you have to overcome that to move. Stop asserting the position, and it's instantly much easier (that's why we "withdraw our presence": this stops us re-activating the "staying still" habit).

> ...or just watch myself do it?

This.

> And how hard is it to let go?

Have you any idea how ridiculous that sounds? ;-) It's better to phrase it as something you stop doing: stop interfering, or "absolute allowing". In terms of what it feels like, it feels like you are stopping holding on to your focus of attention, and it opens out in response. Meanwhile you adopt that attitude that you are okay with whatever happens, including nothing happening.

Don't overthink it. In fact, one problem is you can't conceptualise *non-doing*, and you can't experience *intending* - you can only experience results.

If you want a little exercise to practice, do this one:

- Lie down on the floor. Couple of books to support your head. Feet flat on the floor, knees up.
- Give up to gravity completely. Let go absolutely, of your mind, body and attention. Let them do whatever they will. Give up to "God" or whatever; abandon yourself. Release yourself into the space in the room around you; become that background space. (These are just different ways of saying "let yourself be".)
- "Decide" that you are going to roll over onto your side, but do absolutely nothing about it.
- Wait until your body moves by itself.

Eventually, it will. It'll feel like magic. Then realise that this is how it always is; it's just that you have developed the habit of tensing up your muscles, *tensing up the universe*, to hold it in position, or to "feel yourself doing something".

The feeling of "doing something" that you normally have is actually the feeling of resistance of your bad habit, which you have to push through.

Once you've got the "happens by itself" vibe, experiment with leaving your body functioning that way. Just "decide" things, and let them happen by themselves. One way of conceiving of this is to think of it as "allowing yourself to experience..." something; releasing in a direction, rather than moving in a direction.

The experience is already there, you are just "letting it in". **Letting it "shine through"**.

> I've got a lot of time tomorrow; I'll post results if you want

Do it! Remember, you've spent a lifetime doing the opposite, so it might take a little while for the "moves by itself" exercise to kick in. But this is because you are still resisting a little. You might even feel a bit uncomfortable when it first happens, but stick with it.

> Do you think this can help me find stuff I've lost, like my Gameboy from a few years ago?

Give it a shot. "Just decide" that the Gameboy is going to come back into your possession, and maybe feel excited about this. Then, see what happens.

Something to note: Sometimes the gap between the deciding and the result can take a little while. For instance, if the object is not local, it may take a while before the sequence of actions you feel "inclined" to do (even unwittingly) eventually leads you there. But it's pretty reliable. Fear not, something *is* happening - remember, you can't feel intention at work, only the 3D sensory experience that results from it.

(You've set the pattern on the floor; you're waiting for the image to appear in the room.)

> I try as hard as I can, but I can't seem to really "let go".

Yes, it's not to so easy to let go *if you try to do it*. You're not trying to lose attention, or manipulate yourself into a particular state - you're just aiming to stop interfering and accept whatever experiences come up. You are not meant to be using effort at all. You are *giving up direct control*. For immediate things, like "find the chocolate that's in the house somewhere", you feel an urge to go somewhere. But if it was in the car, say, you might later that day feel the intuition to fix a shelf, which means you go into the garage, and then you suddenly think "I'll just look in the car door sidepocket". That's why, after you "ask", you need to let go and be okay with anything that happens. When it's time to take action, you'll feel the feel.

> Also, this doesn't reach into occult stuff, does it?

Not really, just your extended memory or intuition, which you don't have direct access to, but you can allow to lead you. In effect it's not different to the arm-wrestling or being good at catching (technique: centre your attention behind your forehead, let your body move by itself). You're just trusting your nervous system to operate spontaneously and correctly, rather than trying to control things manually.

There's no danger of "possession" - that's just people being scared that if they loosen control, their own impulses and urges will take them over. Letting go can feel a bit scary though, because it feels like you are lowering your defences and becoming completely open. But you are only lowering your defences *against your own self!* :-)

Remember, the larger picture is basically telling yourself you want something, and then getting out of the way, forgetting about it. The biggest impact is the just the simple one of stress-free living without tensing your body. The "imagination patterns" is then extra icing on top.

It's a great way to working towards being both relaxed and spontaneous, and you'll escape the "trying and hoping" trap which can work against things.

My general feel is that you can't harm your body so long as you aren't forcing it. If you switch you attention to the "open background space" of your awareness, then "just decide" what you are going to do in broad terms, your body will get the job done.

Micro-manage it though, you can't.

> What my teachers always taught and tried to convince everyone, is that muscle reflexes that you would normally only be able to control yourself, like raising your hand, absolutely cannot be autonomic (visceral).

If you have got into the habit of "holding onto" yourself then you will indeed get in the way of things like automatic arm raising - because you are constantly *asserting yourself into your current posture*. If you do that, you then have to "fight past it" to get anything done. This is why people feel they are putting effort into movement and activity, rather than experiencing it "happening to them", as they should.

[...]

I think it's not about her influencing other thoughts, although that's how someone could *imagine* that it was happening (and then the limits that implies would apply). It's more straightforward than that: she is simply *deciding* that something is going to happen and, remaining in a relaxed state, she is then *allowing* that to unfold (without re-deciding or preventing it happening).

Possible interpretations in general (pushing it out a bit here):

I say: We can't tell the difference between experiencing something we caused, something we influenced and experiencing something we predicted, because it amounts to the same thing:

- Although we encounter time in a "moment by moment" sequence, it is actually laid out like a landscape - always there even though you are only "looking" at a certain part.
- If we predict something, we are "reading" the landscape before getting to a location.
- If we assert something, we are "writing" the landscape before getting to a location.
- When we get to the location, it is whatever it is. We can't then tell whether reading/writing occurred specifically, or whether reading/writing occurred indirectly.

  For instance, by "asking for information" you might be implicitly "asking for information that corresponds to your desire", which involves *making* the information correspond to your desire. The background intention or assumption behind the act makes a difference.

Basically, it's like you dream your world. It unfolds spontaneously according to the current "facts"; you have the ability to modify "facts" whether the evidence corresponding to those facts is present within the senses at that moment or not; subsequent experience will be in alignment with those facts. As suggested earlier: once we've made a decision about what's going to happen, though, we have to then not "re-decide' and thereby re-pattern events again, undoing our good work. That's why you need to be non-attached and allowing.

From elsewhere:

However you imagine that it works, That's how it works. - TG

That's one take on it anyway: What you are sensorily experiencing arises as a 'transparent mirage' from the *facts-of-the-world* in the background. All intention operates indirectly, via adjusting the *facts-of-the-world*. We never actually interact with our sensory experience. We never actually "do" anything directly, instead we just experience things.

[...]

The Owls are a good way for people to explore the idea, I think, because it can't cause any damage. Well, bar a few sleepless nights from nocturnal noise, perhaps. (8>)=

A nice way to think of this is, you are "recalling" an idea or thought-pattern into your experience from the background memory of the world. Objects are like ideas overlaid onto experience - and more interestingly, aren't situations a bit like momentarily-present, environment-sized objects?

Worth experimenting with anyway, I would imagine (excuse pun)...

Reply to “Everytime I hear some word, suddenly everyone uses this word”

> > Welcome to the wonderful world of the Baader Meinhof phenomenon: ‘Baader-Meinhof is the phenomenon where one stumbles upon some obscure piece of information—often an unfamiliar word or name—and soon afterwards encounters the same subject again, often repeatedly. Anytime the phrase “That’s so weird, I just heard about that yesterday” would be appropriate, the utterer is hip-deep in Baader-Meinhof’.

Although, **the "Baader-Meinhoff phenomenon" isn't really an *explanation* of anything** - more a *naming* or *categorisation* of an experience, accompanied by some vague "the brain did it" handwaving. We're essentially just saying this is the "Having A Recurring Experience phenomenon - because that's how experiences work". As with some uses of "Confirmation Bias" as a diagnosis, it can often be essentially a contentless general statement that *feels* conclusive, but doesn't really say anything.

For example, calling "Confirmation Bias" really requires that there be a fixed pre-existing reference dataset that is known and being surveyed, and then being selectively perceived. However, in daily life it is not clear that there *is* such a dataset, or at least we must recognise that this is an assumption. If we are to take "glitch" type experiences seriously - seriously *as experiences*, anyway - we can't necessarily take such things at face value. To assume that the world is a "stable, simply-shared, spatially-extended 'place' unfolding in 'time'" in our responses to experiences whose content is *as if* that is not so, is circular or redundant; it doesn't truly respond to the report on its own terms, unless we at least make explicit that assumption and any others.

Reply to “Am I the only one who has had a dream about something that happened in the near future afterwards?”

Ian Wilson's little (free) book on his research is worth a peek: *The Theory of Precognitive Dreams*. He also has made a few posts here and over at /r/dreams under /u/Ian_a_wilson.

> [Ian_a_wilson: Thanks TriumphantGeorge, I did an AMA recently in /r/dreams on this topic. Lots of posters who have the experiences commenting in the thread.]

Really enjoyed your AMA and also the discussion in the other post. It's great to see conversations which are about exploring a topic and presenting ideas as clearly as possible, rather than winning an argument.

Although you partially cover this, I wonder if you could give me a snappy summary of your view on one question:

- What do you see as the relationship between these three aspects of our experience: waking experience, dreaming experience, and thoughts?

[[Ian Wilson: Our waking experiences and dream experiences are parts of a much larger reality system and precognition reveals that there is a dualism between the dream expeirence and the waking expeirence where the waking experience itself is a type of dream world in the literal sense of the word but has a more complex rule-set so to speak to ensure it behaves how we all experience it. But a dream none-the-less. Thought is more than just our inner monologue that we have when awake and ties into how we think relative to content. For example day dreaming is a different way to think. Dreaming is another form of thinking. Thought is capable of programming a reality interface by which we interact with. A dream is an example of what this interface looks like, and how thought describes the dream content much like how computer code would describe a 3D simulated game world. It is all part of language and communication between our individualized waking self and a unified field or collective which embodies the whole reality system et al.

It is through this mechanism of organized thoughts forming communication and shaping dream experiences that we see a creative process where we are contributing not only to our dream content but our waking experiences albiet unconsciously for the most part.]]

Yes, I agree with the idea of different types of thought. When talking of it being a programming *mechanism*, I'm not too sure. I think it's perhaps more direct than that (although it's perhaps nitpicking with metaphor to say so). But it's definitely the way to go. The niggle I had was: why should the waking world be considered special?

So, following some experiments with synchronicity and more dramatic types of change, I've been playing with the view that all experiences *are* thought/imagination, and all that's special about waking life is that it's a very stable *3D-immersive* thought. Other thoughts tend to be localised in mental space and transitional; waking life is a thought that has become stabilised and fills up our mental space, it localises us and the scene surrounds us. It has become a thought "about" *being-a-person-in-a-particular-world* - which really means it "is" *being-a-person-in-a-particular-world*. (When we experiment with direct-entry lucid dreaming, that process of the 2D-thought "snapping into place" as an immersive environment seems to have the same quality?)

This would mean that we don't have to talk about communication between things, between me and the world through some sort of conduit or mechanism. To create a thought "about" the world is to interact *directly* with the world. And any other thoughts belong to their own little world-spaces, although some of those worlds we create might be very small indeed.

So we'd have that *passing* thoughts are simply aspects of the current state of the world flickering by; whereas *intended* thought is an amendment of that state.

This would imply that all time exists at once for any particular world as a sort of "world-pattern". If I change nothing, a particular future is already existing, and my "world-thought" will unfold spontaneously towards that. If I change something by intending change now, *or intending change in the future*, then I shift the whole world accordingly. Hence being able to have precognitive dreams (really: directly accessing that part of the "world-pattern") and updating them (really: directly updating the "world-pattern").

This also means that the *passage* of time belongs to the experiencer, not the world.

The main issue we end up with - in my view definitely, in your view implicitly - regards the dreamer-thinker themselves. If the world is a dream, then nothing we experience in the dream can be the dreamer or the mechanism of dreaming (if indeed there need be a mechanism). For instance, we might dream that we have brains, but those dream-brains can't be what we actually are. So how are we to view ourselves?

> [Ian Wilson: I take the programming mechanism as a metaphor as the role of information processing (thinking) seems similar to how computers process and simulate Cartesian 3D geometry. It's all part of our thought process however which invokes our ability to dream, and the end result of what those dreams are.
>
> As you say, the Waking world is an immersed stable 3D thought. Much more organized and constrained to have consistency, chronological order and almost "genre" specific in how it delivers experiences to the participants. The Lucid Dream which acts like another interface to other reality experiences simply extends us into more creative patterns of experiences. I always view that the experience is real, however the content may not be objective or relative to the waking world. Still relative to the subject having the dream. I agree that as information past/present/future already exist much like how the World of Warcraft exists as information. In our system, there are those tangents of probability which if left alone we course through on auto-pilot but once we engage them and spike change in the probability those qualities cause new probabilities to emerge in the time-line trajectories. Hence as you say the precognitive experiences emerge and we can interface with that information through lucid dreaming and invoke change at run-time. I agree with the updating the world pattern. The world is information, the datastream of thought we interact with and render is what gives us our experience with that information. We are not the body, nor the brain. They are merely interfaces enabling the feedback and rendering of the datastream describing content. We are much much more than these "rendered" artefacts of organized information patterns. It's a good question on how to view our self as we inherit the personality and avatar of a human in the human experience but what we really are is that and more. What is our true self in this? It's astronomical like an awareness fractal branching out into a multi-dimensional informational dataset defining itself through the dreams it has.
>
> Lot's of great points and thoughts as always.]

I like the notion of a "genre-specific" strand of thought!

So, I think my problem with the metaphor is that it implies that the world needs to be "run" or "processed" or "rendered" by some mechanism, and I don't find evidence for that to be true in experience. Strictly speaking, we can't say that the brain or body do this, since these are things *within* our experience. For instance, our experience might be "as if" we have eyes that are the source of vision and colour, but that does not mean eyes *are* the source of vision and colour - see dreams. The same argument applies to brains. How to avoid a potential misstep, remain true to direct experience, and have some sort of sense of the "true self"? Your "awareness branching out into a multi-dimensional informational dataset" is a nice image that points the way.

I would avoid the need for mechanism by introducing a nondualist angle. If what we are is an "open awareness" and the world is a *static* information set of "all possible experiences" which are *already dissolved into that awareness*, then we simplify things: Ongoing experience is like us shifting our shape to reveal individual moments, like an origami paper game, or an evolving filter which lets different patterns become more prevalent, like constellations brightening. In both cases, the information set and the awareness are *one thing*, and the "selection mechanism" is a self-evolving emphasis rather than a processing event.

> [Ian Wilson: The mechanism that renders is consciousness, not a computer. This is why any time we become self-aware and self-realized be it when "physically" awake or lucid in a dream (even non-lucid) we have a reality experience. It is consciousness, and I know how ambiguous that sounds which acts as the rendering farm of information. We are literally software emulating hardware when it comes to physical reality and how this information system bound to our awareness manages experience patterns. It's all self, and the thoughts it generates which yield a myriad of experiences and I do believe it has been evolving this way beyond our concepts of space/time rather in what could very well be absolutism.]

I think we're on the same page. Are you essentially saying (as I would) something like:

- All there is, is consciousness, and consciousness "takes on the shape of" both information and the transformation of information into sensory experience.

My feeling is that space and time *arise-with* our experiences, they are part of our sensory moments or strands of immersive thought. The world-pattern itself is static, flat, eternal but updatable, consisting of a superposition of "dimensionless facts", moments, other organising concepts. Patterns overlaid upon patterns like moire fringes. Since this leaves us with the notion that we can directly edit the "facts" of the world-pattern (via your precognitive dreams or perhaps simply though targeted imagination of other sorts), we are left to ask:

- Is the world-pattern I'm editing *shared*, or do we have our own copies, or some mix of the two?

(Where the "me" in that statement means the conscious perspective or agent I am, rather than the particular body sensation or whatever.)

> [Ian Wilson: My view of consciousness is that it's an attribute of the "self" or the being through which becomes self-aware through consciousness. That all there is, is the Self, and through consciousness it becomes self-realized. However all the creation and transformation of information into sensory forms is how consciousness plays a role in providing the feedback to the self.

> Answering if Reality is shared or not could invoke some sense of Solipsism as I do "believe" the following currently until disproved: At the root of all reality we find the self which has partitioned into many subjective and individualized awareness nodes. We look at our subjective individuality as an awareness node as being separate however we are in fact one unified awareness field so the pattern you are editing is shared with other parts of this unified universal self of which all of us are parts of. However if we move from the part having the experience to the whole we'll find our individualism is like an atom to a molecule, and a cell to a body. All parts of a larger whole.
>
> So is it shared? Yes but with whom? Other parts of yourself in the grand unified field. Where we are all interconnected and literally one cosmic self (hence the Solipsism when addressing the whole)... individualism when addressing it's parts. Does that mean you have to experience what all the other individualized parts are going through, no... but you do retain a thread of experience and personality that defines your role in the ongoing creative process. What we do affects other parts of this whole self. It's all interconnected.]

Ah, so probably some definitions are in order, although the overall picture is similar I think. "Consciousness" is a tricky word. I've played with calling it "awareness" and so on, but there's not really a winning term. One thing I'm never quite decided on is the "creation" aspect; I'm increasingly inclined towards an "eternal" view which means creation must already be complete, it's just a shifting of attention. This has implications for the description.

Anyway - added headings to break it up a bit - apologies for length.

Consciousness As Material

I define "consciousness" as "the non-material material whose only property is *being-aware*". So it's the "stuff" and it is the "true self", before anything has arisen. And through taking on the shape of experience, it knows its-self (becomes *conscious-of* content and *self-conscious* if it views a part of that content as itself).

You can imagine this as a blanket of material which has the property of awareness. Laid flat, it simply "is". When it ripples and folds itself then it can experience itself relative to itself. However, importantly:

- The blanket itself has no properties of "space" and "time", although those are things the blanket can shape itself into.

This image has a couple of implications:

- In this way, no experience or content is ever "the true nature" of things. There is The Truth which never changes and that is simply "being"; and there are the relative truths of the patterns which emerge in consciousness/awareness.
- All patterns and facts are dissolved into the entirety of the material, of consciousness - in much the same way as if you put blue dye into water, "blue" is everywhere and all at once. (See also David Bohm's ink droplet analogy.) These are available everywhere, all at once.
- There are no multiple consciousnesses; it is uncountable. There is simply "consciousness". This means that the idea of solipsism *and* individual consciousness experiences are both meaningless.

> It is in fact impossible to talk about the way in which "multiple" consciousness experiences exist. This is because time and space are aspects of the experience, and do not exist outside of that. There is no "space between"experiences, and there is no "time interval" between them.

In order to think about a concept, we have to divide things into parts then arrange them in mental space, because thinking is basically a "shadow-sensory" experience. The underlying reality is *before* such things. So here we must simply not speak.

The World-Sharing Model

However, we're not completely stuck. Personal experimentation tends to reveal aspects of *both* a "private view" model *and* a "shared world" model. I think they can be reconciled for the the purpose of daily life as follows:

- The world is *not* a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time". It is not a *shared environment*. Time and space are aspects of experiencing, not of the world.
- What the world is, is a coherent collection of all possible patterns that can be experienced. These are available everywhere-simulataneously, dissolved into the conscious space you are experiencing now.
- The world, then, is a *shared resource*, a toy box of patterns, rather than a "place".

So everything is the most deeply interconnected it could possibly be: there is no separation at all except as an experience. The experience you have now *is* that of being The Entirety, having a particular experience.

God Of The Private View

This means we end up saying stuff like: You are God of the entire universe, a private universe that you own, and it is directly under your control, to be directed and edited as you please. However, this is also true of everybody else in a "parallel-simultaneous" fashion.

So probably the same description as yours, just reworded in other terms. I think the insight into the way that multiple selves are not related in time and space (or that it is meaningless to discuss it in those terms) is important though; it allows "private views" without solipsism.

The next question:

- If I am the entirety of my current experience, in what sense can I "do" anything?

Because surely any "doing" is just another experience; my actions can have no causal power. Do I not instead have to "become" the desired state, by shifting my shape? Do I need to go through the "have a dream and update it" precog process necessarily when I make amendments, if really the whole world-pattern is here right now?

Can I perhaps simply "recall" my desired state into experience, like recalling memory from the "memory-block" of all patterns dissolved into the background of consciousness?

Reply to “Asked myself for an answer I couldn't have known, and received the correct one.”

Was the bad feeling a sense of, perhaps, *exposure* - perhaps mixed with a sense of danger (basically, risk of annihilation of your "localised self", best I can describe it)?

[...]

[[Q: Any tips for how someone might do this themselves? As an experiment I tried the following:

1. Open a random number generator.
2. Decide that I will push the button soon, and understand that after I push the button, I will know what number it delivers.
3. Empty my mind by focusing on the sounds in the environment around me.
4. Think about my future self, and ask my future self what the number is.
5. Press the button and compare to the number in my mind.

Every time, I'm way off.]]

Great idea! Experiment time. I can't try now but suggest: don't focus on the environment, put your attention towards "the space you are looking out from". In other words, reverse your attention.

> without censoring yourself

That's a really good phrasing for it.

[...]

An alternative interpretation of this, is that it's simply the case that we can "ask for experiences" and, if we do so with conviction and get out of the way for the resulting "movement", they will happen:

- Ask for "the experience of telling this woman the correct directions", the experience arises.
- Ask for "the experience of knowing *this* piece of information", the experience arises.

It doesn't matter how we frame it to ourselves (as looking into the future, reading the other person's mind, or having lived it before), the essential observable is: you have an experience.

Any explanation for "what happened" that we come up with afterwards is just a *made-up story we create in our imagination*. In fact, it operates by the same rules: we seek a plausible-ish story, and we experience coming up with one, even "knowing" it if we sought certainty...

Hmm. "Ask and receive", eh?

This does of course mean there is no "solid, spatially-extended world" beyond your immediate sensory experience - just maybe a gloop of "dimensionless facts" which are accessible (and subject to change).

Reply to “Dead cousin is coming to dinner tonight.”

> [OP: Last night I was on phone with my mom, and she told me to come over for dinner. Everything was going great. Then suddenly she comes out with "Janet is going to be there!" I was like, very funny mom, great one. But in my head I was thinking that's really not funny, why would you say something like that? Then my mom keeps going on with this. "You haven't seen her in forever, it'll be nice, etc."
>
> Janet died last year! I have a vivid memory of it. I did -not- attend the funeral, but I remember everyone talking about it and making a scene of it because she died young. She died of cancer and I remember her husband coming to visit and being very depressed. I never saw her body or anything, but I'm 1000% certain this woman is dead and I remember many family members talking about it.
>
> I never saw the body or visited her grave, and I wasn't that close with her so I never had much grief over it. But I have vivid memories of her dying and my relatives being depressed over it.
>
> I was really weirded out by my mom on the phone, and finally I came out and said "Janet's dead, what are you talking about?" And my mom just kept talking like it was ridiculous or like I was kidding around. She jokingly said "She's back!" or something like that.
>
> I asked my dad later on and he looked at me like I was insane. I also can't find the obituary online (but I never looked for it to begin with).
>
> I'm assuming one of 3 things is happening:
>
> 1. My parents snapped from grief and are imagining my dead cousin is coming to dinner.
> 2. I switched universes where Janet never died
> 3. A zombie is coming to dinner.
>
> I guess I'll update this post and let you know how it goes? Did anything like this ever happen to someone else?
>
> I changed the name for paranoia/privacy.]
>
> [Q: I keep thinking about this story all the time. Either it's a hoax or a fascinating story about the kind of reality we live in. One idea I have about this leads me to the hypothesis that we live our lives in one timeline, but we can communicate in some way with ourselves in another timeline. Dossey doesn't really explore this idea much in his book about premonitions. It's a book mostly about documenting that premonitions frequently happen.
>
> Suppose this woman lived out her life in one timeline where her baby died that night. Imagine how she might have felt and all the years she wished that she had not left her baby under the chandelier. Then, she gets a second chance to live her life with her child, because somehow, she managed to communicate with herself across timelines, using the power of premonitions. It's just a hypothesis and I don't know how to go about testing it. The story just seems to have that implication to me.]

Or: *all time is all at once*, and at any point in the timeline you can influence the rest of the time line, from the ground up. *Re-seed your reality* as it were. As a single pattern.

So, at the point where the baby died, the woman *super-intends* that it never happened, at which point the timeline is amended in the least invasive way possible - which, obviously, is for her to have an appropriate dream (no material changes need happen in that case) and then make a different decision - to prevent it.

I'd suggest that the notion of timelines is merely a diagrammatic convenience used for explaining things; there's no such thing as branching, etc, really. The alternative formulation - the grid of all possible experiences, which we traverse over time - is the most general, but even that is an abstraction. It is never experienced. Even the other three dimensions are a bit suspect sometimes...

The difference is between multiple timelines and re-seeding/all-time-at-once arises when you think: How do you cross timelines or communicate between timelines? *Which* woman has her baby die, and which woman has it live? Or is it the same woman? If each woman-version occupies a different timeline, there is no advantage in sending a message back: her baby is already dead. That another, forever-inaccessible baby lives means nothing (and truly, there would be no bridge between these 'timeline universes'; they are not spatially arranged).

"Re-seeding, all-time-at-once" = rewritable, but self-consistent, single *apparent* timeline*:

Woman's baby dies, she wishes it hadn't, the timeline updates so it didn't, and now the baby always lived, but there was a dream about it dying, which resulted in the action that led to its survival.

Effectively, at the point of wishing, her *present moment shifts* discontinuously to a new state in which the baby is alive, with a remembered-past now consistent with that outcome - the explanation for her now being beside a crushed crib "accounted for" by the dream and subsequent action that she now remembers in her past.

. In effect, you are just changing the present, with a new past memory in it. So even the notion of a single timeline is just a convenience, a mind-construct.*

> This seems to imply that either way you look at it in the abstract, looking at it one way or the other only serves as a mind-construct.

Essentially, yes. It's fine for *thinking-about*, as it were. When we focus on explaining the real world version, we have to account for a few things.

Let's take "right now" to be the moment of the woman waking up and seeing the crib smashed and the time on the clock. She now has cause to recall the previous events: she remembers having a dream, she remembers moved the baby, she sees the time on the clock. She tries to account for what happened. She thinks...

There's an issue with timelines communicating with each other: If all timelines unfold at the same time, how can the woman in one timeline communicate to the past of another timeline? The moment is already gone in both timelines. Unless both timelines are both "complete" already, in which case it's too late and there's a good timeline and a bad timeline already: one happy woman and one unhappy woman. If they're complete and there is a way of communicating and so one timeline updates another, why not just have a single, self-updating timeline?

I see three ways around this that fit what we know:

1. The woman's intention to save her baby simply updates "right now" and there's no such thing as a timeline really. (No Timeline)

2. The woman's intention updates/rewrites the timeline she is on, sends a dream into the past, which ripples to her present. She updates/reseeds her own timeline. (Single Timeline)
3. The third requires some pondering about what the "woman" is: In regards to the "same person" issue, I'd say that what you are is the "consciousness that experiences your situation", which includes your personality. In other words, your character can change, but you're still you. In this case, perhaps changing timelines is just a case of "refocusing" from your current timeline to another one. Timeline people are "viewports" for experiences, if you like. So in this case, the woman *jumps timelines*. She detaches from the bad timeline, and refocuses on the good timeline. She is now looking through the eyes of a body whose baby was saved. (Multiple/Infinite Timelines)

What do we *actually know*, though? That she remembers a dream. That she remembers moving the baby. That the chandalier fell. That the clock time corresponds to the remembered dream. She doesn't remember jumping timelines. Nor does she remember a discontinuity in her experience (reality "shifting"). How things happened seems to always have been how things happened. Her experience of now and remembering the past is *self consistent* - coherent.

I'd say the version with the minimum "new parts" invented and added to reality is number one: She intended the baby be alive, and reality shifted to have this be the case. This requires that for some reason she would get up and move the baby. The dream narrative works for that. When intending she may even have said to herself *I wish I had known about this before, I would have moved the baby, even if I'd had a dream about it beforehand* - and reality shifted so that this was the case.

(The problem with "timelines" and "branches" for me is that nobody every experienced them. Where are the timelines stored, where to they take place? How do I get from one to the other? Does the whole universe actually get duplicated every time there's a change? Or is there just an infinite number of universe, covering all possibilities? It's easier surely just to have one, self-consistent universe that takes everything into account, and is updatable. It's just a bit harder to think about or draw diagrams of...)

To expand a bit on the 1-2-3 options

For me, Occam's Razor suggests (1). Although it's harder to think about, it involve less extra parts. When we remember something, we don't "reach into the past" and we don't even have a full memory, we create a memory *in the present* based on some sort of trace. Often, people who had the same experience differ in their recall.

This suggests to me that there is just "now", and as "now" changes, it leaves traces, which are then used to create ("now") an image of a "past" by inference.

Alan Watts had a nice metaphor: the ship and its wake. A ship travels along the ocean, leaving its wake behind it. Would anyone say that the wake *causes* the ship, *causes* the movement of the ship? No. In the same way, the past doesn't cause the present, it is a trace left in the present, by the present changing.

For the purpose of *thinking* though, it's easy to diagram/mentally assemble the idea of a timeline (for straight past-present-future) or branching (to imagine "options" and choices being made). However, we can demonstrate to ourselves that this is just a habit of thought:

Think of a past event. Now *point to where that event seems to be*. Do the same with an anticipated future event. Now, most people imagine past events to the left, future events to the right, present now, on an imaginary thought-timeline. (In other cultures, they imagine this as back-to-front literally: past to the back of them, future to the front.)

So it's an approach of convenience; we can't find it in our actual experience.

> > Consider how Einstein changed our view of how time passes. That's not a straight forward and easy way to think about time. It's much easier to assume that our human perceptions about time give us an accurate sense about time.

That's a very good point. How we think about it (above) and how it is - quite counterintuitive (however it is).

Branching and Many-Worlds

I find the Many-Worlds interpretation to be a bit of a clunker myself (even though I find it attractive, in my imagination). It's just a way to try an escape from the probabilistic interpretation of QM. Without a way to actually *detect* the other universes, it's non-falsifiable, and basically not scientific. It's in the maths, but not in "reality". Whatever that is. :-)

It *is* a really nice mental picture though. One of the visualisations I had for "jumping realities" went for the grid-of-possibilities notion.

> > It could work sort of like how a computer game simulates a world for a user. The game processes the current state of the world, together with the current user input, to generate the next state of the world. The game doesn't have a complete tree of all possible worlds, given all possible user interactions.

That's a nice image. It goes quite nicely with the grid-of-possibilities approach too. Ever read /r/Outside? It imagines the world-as-computer-game. Which leads to another possibility...

Shared Dreams and Extended Persons

If what each of us "is", is a consciousness - and a *creative* consciousness at that - then we can maybe do without having to pre-make universes, or having whole universes create themselves when there's a change, or having grid of possibilities. If we are "consciousness + beliefs + intentions" then we could propose that each person lives the dream that they want. It is a personal dream, but it also overlaps with other consciousnesses which share your beliefs. When your intentions differ, your dreams will cease to overlap with those whose intentions are counter to yours.

There are no timelines, just lost of "nows", perspectives, intermingled, co-creating.

When the woman discovered her dead baby, she *super-intended* for it not to happen. Her dream was then updated to take account of that. Since there were hardly any other observers, that wasn't a problem - no counter-intentions. The dream updates for all participants, *with a modified trace of the past*:

If, however, other people had seen the baby dead, that might change things. We then have these possibilities:

a) It would not be able to be undone, because of "conceptual momentum" of others who witnessed the vent (the beliefs of others being strong and preventing the chance), or

b) It would be undone, because nobody would oppose the undoing of this event - no-one is intending against the change, or

c) The woman's perspective becomes 'de-coherent' and her dream continues with an alive baby, other participants dream continues with a dead baby.

d) The death of the baby remains a fact.

But this leaves us with one thing to tackle: If the dreams 'de-cohere', become split, what happens to the apparent woman who is left in c) when the dreaming woman has split off? Two options:

a) We are *extended beings*, a representation of each of us is present in everyone's dream. All versions. It' just that our "consciousness" only engages with one particular aspect of our extended self. (This gets close to being another version of Many Worlds though.) Better:

b) Philosophical zombies. It doesn't matter whether a consciousness is "looking through" a person or not. The mind and body will continue 'on automatic' even if no consciousness is experiencing it. It simply will never get re-directed by the 'free will' of the consciousness. It will roll along its present trajectory.

Brains and Timelines

> Although our brains may have evolved to the level where we naturally have a means to communicate between timelines, that doesn't necessarily mean that we could transport between them. Who knows though, maybe some technology could make that possible, something like on the TV show Sliders.

Yes, so what we've just done is switch "brains" for "consciousness" and allowed ourselves to effectively gain control over our own "now" - and hence apparent timeline. We don't need to do the jump or communication though, because we always basically choose the version of the world (dream) that we want. It's other people (consciousnesses) which get left with the bad stuff, if they 'de-cohere'.

We've moved away a bit from a materialistic view here, but I thought it was worth exploring to see what ideas it added in terms of getting away from a physical branching - maybe going more towards an "informational universe" idea?

[...]

Surely the difference between intuition and premonition is just the time at which the 'fact" is true. Intuitions are about "facts now", premonitions are about "facts later"... but they must still involve "facts now"?

The chandelier case involves "facts now": additional knowledge about now: that she sensed *now* that the chandelier was unsafe, and even when it would "fail". That information was available "in the universe", at that time. Effectively, it's still intuition, but not restricted to body-based-information intuition?

> Some things lend themselves to scientific investigation better than others.

True. One-off life events can't be studied under lab conditions. There is no regularity or repeatability, and they are rarely of the same 'nature' between instances. I doubt we'll ever really be able to study premonitions of this type beyond anecdote collection.

> [Q: I like this idea about information available in the universe. With respect to the woman's premonition story, I wonder if she didn't act or think in some way after her baby died which assisted her own access to that information at the point in time where she had the premonition. With all of the information available in the universe, her dream focused precisely on the information that would help her to save her baby. I also like the idea of thinking about intuitions and premonitions as essentially the same. I've never thought about it that way. That seems helpful. People in general tend to accept that intuitions happen, even though we can't explain how they happen. Yet, many people can't accept that premonitions happen. I think notions about the arrow of time prevent people from accepting that premonitions really happen.]

Good point about the 'arrow of time'. But if all information's available, all time is now, effectively. (Neville Goddard has a nice line in one of his books: Everything is deterministic, except when you make a change via intention, at which point you shift the direction, and it plays out deterministically again from that point, in that direction. So everything can be known of past and future, except for the changes brought about by this creative interference.)

Also: see my other, clumsy comment on timelines elsewhere in this thread, describing the intention. You only ever need to change *now*. We just often have a bit of a bias against dramatic discontinuities taking place as explanations - but it's an easier explanation than "multiple timelines" actually. There's one unfolding experience, but all moments contribute to the entirety, which is effectively an updating of "now".

(She doesn't need to have actually had the dream at the time, she just needs to end up stood beside a broken crib, holding an alive baby, and having a *memory* of a dream and of getting up that accounts for and is consistent with her "current present moment". How could you tell the difference? Your whole reality could change right at this minute: you could turn into a Belgian sailor, and as long as when you looked for a memory you got a consistent one, you'd be okay with that. Sailor.)

Reply to “I'm pretty certain that I died in December of 2014.”

I don't think there is a higher power. If there were, it would be some sort of "Librarian" who is there to help us "readers" have the experiences we want.

When you die - which is a result of getting into a situation which doesn't have an obvious *next-moment* - I think you just switch discontinuously into another experience. That might be one where you suddenly avoided the car crash somehow; it might be you have some sort of other-world experience; it might be that you switch to experiencing being born again.

Current metaphor: *The Hall of Records*

Imagine that you are a conscious being exploring a Hall of Records for this world. You are connecting to a vast memory bank containing all the possible events, from all the possible perspectives, that might have happened in a world *like this*. Like navigating through an experiential library. And there may be any number of customers perusing the records. So this is not solipsism: Time being meaningless in such a structure, we might say that "eventually" all records will be looked-through, and so there is always consciousness experiencing the other perspectives in a scene. At the same time, this allows for a complex world-sharing model where influence is permitted, because "influencing events" simply means navigating from one 3D sensory record to another, in alignment with one's intention. This process of navigation could be called *remembering*. Practically, this would involve summoning part of a record in consciousness and having it *auto-complete* by association. This would be called *recall*. You can observe something like this "patterned unfolding" occurring in your direct conscious experience right now.

I do like the idea that we might one day develop a *Library Guide for Researchers* which would help us all navigate this stuff more easily. The extrapolated version of this (we need to answer, "how do we select the memory records"?) would end up being something similar to this [The Patterning of Experience], perhaps.

In other words... it sounds like you have had an incredibly tough time, but that doesn't mean you are doomed to have a tough time "forever".

I'm being a little bit playful of course! Although not dismissive.

However, the idea that this metaphor evokes - that you are *experiencing* this life, this moment, but what you are is not *equivalent* to this life - is valid. This just provides an accessible way to think about it.

The true takeaway is this: That if we are making assumptions about "what happens next" or "what the purpose is" based on the everday evidence of the senses, it is likely incorrect or at least incomplete. The stories on this subreddit suggest that the larger picture is more subtle. I think there is a case for optimism.

Reply to “Felt reality "shift" after hydroplaning, girlfriend texts me immediately afterwards concerned that something feels "off".”

Hmm. All people are NPCs, including you - you just happen to be looking "through the perspective" of one particular NPC. Furthermore, all actions arise spontaneously and are simply the "experience of acting".

Really, it is all just happening to you... "you" being a "consciousness" in which experiences appear, with the details depending on who you are tuned into...

Not solipsism, because there's not just you, there's not *even* you. Also, there's no reason why other "consciousnesses" can't be looking through other NPCs. However the behaviour of an NPC does not depend on it being so experienced. Also, it might be argued the *same* eternal consciousness is eventually looking through the perspectives of everyone...

TL;DR: If you "jump dimensions" then you are not leaving anyone behind. It's just a bunch of NPC-centred dreams.

[...]

Yeah, I think we always have to separate experiences from the explanation. If someone has an experience, it's a "real experience" - however, any descriptions in terms of "quantum suicide" or "multi-verses" or "dimensions" are basically *metaphors* to help get a handle on it. Sometimes those metaphors can be used as the basis of a practice to bring about change, but again, that just means the metaphor is useful, not "how things really are". So we shouldn't get too hung up on them.

This applies to subjective and objective descriptions equally (e.g. Things like "mass" and "force" are great concepts which allow us to create symbolic descriptions of observations, descriptions which have predictive power, but they are not "really real" beyond this.)

TL;DR: Trust your experiences, but don't get too hung up on your stories *about* those experiences.

Reply to “Is this what going crazy feels like? (crosspost from Mandela Effect)”

> > There is nothing in quantum physics to explain having memories of a different world, or timeline if you will.

Well, there's nothing in quantum physics to particularly suggest many worlds either, although it's one of a set of unfalsifiable interpretations that are fun. Many-worlds is a philosophical musing; it's not scientific. However, surely in the "quantum immortality" view, what's happening is that we are shifting "state" - shifting to a state where the "person" we are persists? And since each "state" is basically a complete set of facts of the world, that state must *also* include our memories. Therefore, such a shift might well result in a different apparent history, and differing memories. As far as "other observers" go, there's nothing we can say about that. We can only speak from our own subjective experience of an increasingly observation-defined view.

The way I use "shift" is to indicate that the content of our experience changed to a different state. Aren't you assuming here that memories necessarily correspond to prior experiences? Really, there is no history other than that represented in the current state.

Let's try this:

- Let's use the word "configuration" for the total arrangement of the world as held in my consciousness = (x, y, z, m). Where, for illustration, I am using "m" to represent the set of memories "in your brain".
- Each "state" corresponds to a particular configuration. S1 = (x1, y1, z1, m1), S2 = (x2, y2, z2, m2), and so on.

If you are in S1, then S1 includes all the facts of the world, including the memories, m1, in your brain. The memories aren't *in the past*, they are *now* but "about" the past.

If my consciousness suddenly becomes attached to (colloquially: shifts to) S2, it is perfectly possible for me to have a set of memories m2=m1. That doesn't necessarily mean that m2 corresponds to experiences I actually had, to the state of the world (x2, y2, z2).

Remember, *I* am not necessarily promoting such a view, I'm just outlining how it would work.

Personally I think that quantum mechanics *as it actually is*, has nothing much to say other than highlight the nature of observation vs abstraction. I'd be inclined towards a simpler metaphysical model which deals more directly with experiences arising in consciousness (although the result would be much the same). However...

> > No quantum theory or possible interpretation explains why you would have memories from a different state.

They are not "from" the different state, they are part of the current state but *apparently* "about" another state. Sticking to a physicalist model:

- There's nothing special about memories; they are just arrangements of atoms in the brain - B(x, y, z).
- The arrangement of atoms in the brain is not bound in an ongoing way, via a continuous causal link, to other arrangements of atoms in the 'outside' world, W(x, y, z).

- There is no reason why the state of the world cannot change such that the patterns of B(x, y, z) remain the same as in the previous state, while those in W(x, y, z) are different.

One *might hypothesise* that in a catastrophic circumstance, the total configuration S = B + W, goes through something like this:

- For the continuation of consciousness to "make sense", the configuration of W(x, y, z) changes to a safe situation.
- Meanwhile, since the brain is in effect always being observed, the state of B(x, y, z) is held in its current configuration.
- We end up in a final overall state, S(x, y, z) where the memories accessed from B will no longer be consistent with the subsequent observations of W.

Of course, if B(x, y, z) was not under observation at the time, then it might not be saved from change, and the inconsistency problem won't arise, and nobody would ever know.

EDIT: Obviously, we are assuming quantum immortality is a thing here, and trying to explain stories with it. If we want to go into the validity of interpretations of quantum mechanics, the nature of measurement etc, that's a whole other deal.

> If you don't know what observation is in a quantum sense, you're not going to get to a satisfying explanation. It has nothing to do with consciousness at all.

Well, we can chat away about what constitutes a measurement or "fixing", but for us to get anywhere on *this* topic, we'll have to include consciousness, won't we? (And you already have, implicitly.)

Let's back up a moment and clear something up, which might make the rest of it sort itself out too. So far, we've not specified perspectives, *or* been clear what we mean by consciousness. And we can't get anywhere with this without switching to a subjective view, I suggest.

To me, it seems that you are visualising things "objectively", as a view from nowhere, with consciousness travelling on some sort of branching trajectory, almost like it is an 'entity' crossing a landscape. What is it doing - hopping from brain to brain? I think this has of problems, not least of which is that it perhaps means our trajectories must be fully deterministic? (See example later.)

So here's how I'm taking it (I'm changing B to M=memories for clarity):

- I am talking from the subjective perspective of a "conscious observer", at all times.
- That observer is in a state, S = M + W, which completely defines the world, and defines (is) its direct experience at that moment.
- The principle of "quantum immortality" says that the observer will *always* be in a state, and so will always have an experience.

Meanwhile:

- You have asserted that M must always be consistent with W.
- I am suggesting that M needn't necessarily be consistent with W.

I am suggesting that so long as the current state is always coherent as a whole, all is well. And M being consistent with W is not a requirement for this. It's perfectly okay for my memories not to match my surroundings. And this has to be true, surely? It's often true anyway.

Example

Say our friend above is about to die in a swimming accident, but obviously he won't because he's immortal. At what point does he not-die? He's at the very bottom of the ocean, and gives out his last breath. What happens then? There is no plausible *next-state* that doesn't involve some sort of discontinuity. The *next-state* has to be one where it didn't happen at all. This is remarkably improbable, but it is still possible and by "quantum immortality" it is *required*. And it's more probable than him suddenly becoming a dolphin. So, perhaps he's suddenly on the beach and didn't go swimming, and has no memory. But in stories on this subreddit, people experience being reset to before their accident, or suddenly being in a safe location, and so on - obviously with memories intact. And this makes sense, right? Things should unfold until the point where there is no plausible *next-moment*, otherwise we'd have to be traveling along a fully predetermined path.

> Assuming quantum immortality, he will survive in a world where his consciousness still exists.

This is the core of our disagreement. We're going to need to properly consider:

- What is a world? (You seem to be treating it like a "place" rather than a *state*.)
- What is consciousness? (You seem to be treating it like a "thing" rather than *that which experiences a state*.)

But let's continue...

Mutiplicity, Forking, Determinism

> Assuming quantum immortality, he will survive in a world where his consciousness still exists.

How many of him are there? Surely the only way to avoid multiplicity is to consider that there is *one* of him (one consciousness) that is in a particular state.

> The moment of the last breath won't work because it's extremely unlikely that any event could change the outcome from that point.

My response would be that *if quantum immorality is required* then that doesn't matter. Probabilities are normalised, likeliness is relative not absolute. There is always a probability, say, that I will suddenly find myself on the beach, discontinuously. And as other options are eliminated, that probability might become 20%, 50%, 70%, later 100%. The alternatives are that "something" *looks ahead and knows in advance*, and so those unlikely options never arise - but that means everything is predetermined, which doesn't work surely? - or that they are lots of him and they fall one by one - but that makes screws the whole thing up.

> So, we have to look at events that could change to prevent the death.

But if the events have already happened, they can't change? Your *next-state* might be such that it didn't seem to happen, and you may or may nor retain memories, but it can't "not happen in advance".

> In this new world, his consciousness isn't identical. It starts to change at the moment of the fork.

When is this fork though? The fork must happen before the accident, while avoiding the accident is still plausible. What happens to consciousness then? The fork must happen before actual death. What do the other people see in the "world where he dies"; does he act like a zombie until he drowns?

> at the point of death in this world, his consciousness would only exist in a world where the dying never happened.

But we've already said that the fork must happen before we get to the death? Unless there are multiple consciousnesses. Actually, how *does* a fork "know to happen"?

> There is no reason to believe that memories of a different world could leak into this one somehow. It just simply doesn't exist.

In the subjective view, there's no 'leakage', because there aren't actually multiple worlds in a physical sense, and memories belong to the subjective perspective.

Objective vs Subjective

All these problems arise because (I suggest) you are imagining this from an objective perspective that doesn't exist: imagining a starting point, with forking happening at certain moments, spawning copies of worlds, and consciousness travelling along "alive" paths only - all as if this structure actually exists independently of an observer.

If you flip it round to a subjective viewpoint, where the conscious observer has what amounts to a "private state", and each *next-moment* happens on a probabilistic basis, all of these problems go away. You automatically get "quantum immortality" because the conscious observer always exists; only the *content* or state changes. The world *is* the state of the observer. (This is the route Christopher Fuch's QBism interpretation takes, for slightly different but still related reasons.)

In this view, there are no rigid rules as regards memory, because all that matters is that at any moment the state itself is coherent as a configuration. And there is no problem with memory states differing from the state of the apparent world, they are not connected by an ongoing link to the past - no state has a past, it is completely self-contained.

Just to say up front: I'm not a dualist, that kinda takes care of itself. The main thing is: there is no "outside view" to my take on this, which I think dodges quite a few hurdles.

You

So, in your description of quantum immortality, which is imagined from an objective viewpoint (you imagining being "outside" of the system and seeing this stuff happen):

- It doesn't really involve a particular conscious person living forever. It amounts to lots of duplicate persons (more accurately: duplicates at the point of creation, they then instantly differ) each of whom are conscious.

- Since forking happens constantly and started at the very beginning of the universe, we are basically dealing with a finite but enormous infinite number of worlds, each with a copy of our person (at this moment).
- Meanwhile, there is no communication between the worlds, they are sealed. From inside a world, strictly speaking we can say nothing about the other worlds.
- Those worlds are "made from" energy/matter.
- Consciousness is emergent somehow in some regions of that energy/matter but not others.

(This reminds me of why I think many-worlds is so ridiculous! Although it's fun because of it!)

In this view, we are envisaging that the multiple mathematical solutions of an equation are "real" and exist, even though only one solution is actually observed. Now, the problem with this is that it is unfalsifiable - but that's why we're doing philosophy here of course. :-)

The meaning of "quantum suicide" in this version:

- It's not so much that *your* consciousness persists, it's that one of the *many* consciousnesses will inevitably correspond to the path of survival.
- Really, this is *many worlds, many deaths, single survivor*.

Me

In my description of quantum immortality, which is imagined from a subjective viewpoint (from the point of view of an actual conscious observer, basically a person):

- We are only describing the situation of a conscious observer (or *mind*).
- The conscious observer is in a particular state, and will always been in a state. This is the observer's "private view" of the world.
- The current experience of the observer = that state, obviously.
- Meanwhile, there is no communication between any other observers. From inside a "private view", strictly speaking we can say nothing about other observers.
- These observers are made from whatever it is that states are made from - we could call it energy.
- The conscious observer is conscious by definition, and since the world is his state rather than something separate from him, there is no dualism or emergence to worry about.

In this view, we are envisaging that the multiple mathematical solutions of an equation represent the *expectations of the observer based on his state*. As more information becomes available, these expectations narrow down to a single value, which is the point of observation. The observation is "real", but the expectations are not. (Fuchs describes this better, of course.) The benefit of this is that it doesn't propose anything that cannot be observed.

The meaning of "quantum suicide" in this version:

- If a person exists, then they *by definition* survive because a person *is* a conscious observer (or *mind*) in a particular state.
- This is *single world, no deaths, single survivor*.

Joining it up

So my problem with *your* "quantum suicide" - based on many-worlds - is that when you look at it, it's the story of lots of different people, most of whom die. You're having to sacrifice the notion of a single identity. The consciousness you are right now, reading this message, might be the one to die in an accident next month. That will be *you, dead*. Sure, another copy of you might carry on, but it won't be *you*.

In *my* "quantum suicide" - based on QBism and "private views" - I really do survive forever. I am by definition always in the "winning" POV because it's the only one there is - my experience always continues, just by the nature of being a conscious observer.

Now, obviously neither of them can be verified. Technically, if I shoot myself I can prove to myself that I am right. You, on the other hand, can never prove yourself right. However, I think my version *potentially* allows stories on this subreddit to be explained - such as the resets, the memory shifts, and so on - because memories do not necessarily need to change with everything else, memories are laid down sequentially as observations are made. Memories belong to the observer rather than to the world. (At a push, you could think of M and W, from earlier, as being two parts of a brain. Why would a sudden change in W necessarily cause a change in M?)

As you say, the laws of physics are obeyed, but in a squeezed situation, unlikely changes of state *do* become more probable relatively speaking. Just as there's a small probability an electron will tunnel through a barrier, so there is always a probability that the world will shift very discontinuously.

Usually the relative likelihood is negligible, of course. But if in my version, I fall off a cliff and my body is destroyed, experience *must* continue from that moment, so one of the more unlikely outcomes *must* happen. There are no prior branches; there *is* only this observer, which is *always* in *some* state or other.

Note - The subjective version doesn't mean there is no shared world as such; it's just that the larger world becomes a dimensionless "shared resource" of information equivalent to "all possible states". There is no time or space between observers, in much the same way as there wouldn't be with multiple worlds.

[...]

> [Q: It's not exactly like that. It's more like if an ant dies, then there are still a lot of ants that didn't die. The other ants will never have experienced dying. They don't suddenly have the memory of some random other ant dying. The only thing is, that since this is a series of universes that hold different possibilities, somebody there is going to look exactly like you with the exact same lifestory, except they didn't die. So *you* are not immortal. Your conscious may be, dependent on how that works, but that doesn't mean you get to keep the memories. In that regard it's more like, if you are fast asleep and somebody tickles you but you didn't notice, then you'll never know. Your body will know, because it felt the tickling, but consciously you'll never be aware. Which means that you'll simultaneously be aware and responding and at the same time you'll never ever know. If your body died, your conscious wouldn't know it got tickled one random night, nor would your body hold your memories if your

> brain stopped functioning. The memories are still separate, even if we imagine one could exist without the other.]

Hey, yeah I was just trying to work up a formulation which fits OP's story (follow the thread for the details) and actually does give single-perspective immortality.

As it stands - and as you indicate - that many-worlds description isn't immorality, it's effectively a set of clones (not even!), one for each possible branch and hence outcome. If each clone has its own consciousness, it's not immortality, it's just survival of the luckiest clone. And how does consciousness get created at the branch? Or if there's one consciousness which transfers, then are the other clones empty? There are logical problems with that process. If it's a distributed consciousness but there's a notion of "attention" being on one, then isn't that effectively just a single perspective adopting different states? (Also: what is consciousness? Emergence is a hope, not a theory. Better if we can avoid the issue completely.)

Really, the problems arise from the idea of actual creation of branches in time, which itself comes from imagining an objective view which can never be experienced (the problem with most quantum interpretations).

If instead you switch to a subjective perspective (as some recent interpretations have sought to do), a lot of these problems go away. Instead of multiple worlds being created, never interacting, and struggling to account for the operation of consciousness, we have a "conscious observer" as the starting point. And the "world" is whatever state that observer is currently in, and the observer is always in some state or other. You can have all the same laws of physics, immortality is built in, and consciousness doesn't need to be explained - it's fundamental.

Here, instead of ever-multiplying non-interacting worlds with an observer inside them, you have non-interacting observers each of whom are in a world-state. Multiple observers are not connected in time and space (which are aspects of experiences) so their creation makes no difference, and in fact it makes no sense to talk of their creation since they have no context in terms of time or location.

Anyway, interesting to play with.

The point of the thread was to explore the notion of quantum immortality (in the sense of: a theory of immortality based on the concept of quantum states) as it could be applied to OP's story and to other stories of near death with subsequent changes - i.e. cheating death and having a subsequent discontinuity between memory and experience.

Okay, so let's pursue...

What you've described is the "attentional" model of quantum immortality, but it's fraught with philosophical problems, mostly arising from imagining "objectively" a system that can never actually be observed in any way.

EDIT: Actually, sorry, it's not even the attentional model. These are simply separate consciousnesses or aspects of a single consciousness, which operate independently and are therefore essentially separate.

> It means you have several consciousnesses, that are all active at the same time.

I don't see how it can make sense to say that "you" have "several consciousness"? What is this "you" in that case?

In what sense is another consciousness "me" if I'm never aware of it and can never be aware of it? Are all consciousnesses not therefore having an independent experience? Then, in what sense are they not actually separate consciousnesses?

Surely these other "me"s are as much me only in the sense that other people are me. In the sense that "consciousness" can never die - as independent from particular manifestations as "people". I-as-consciousness might be immortal, but my *identity* is not immortal.

So when you say "still you in all senses of the word", that is not true in the way most people experience and conceive of themselves, which is as an observer with an identity and a history. It's basically a restatement of the mystical approach - i.e. that consciousness is undivided and eternal, although its forms may rise and fall.

[...]

The issue remains, on what we consider as "you" and what we think of as "consciousness". Which are both perhaps philosophical points, hovering at the subjective-objective border, and not really resolvable by thought or external experiment, I suggest. We might *assert* that these are identical with arrangements of atoms in the brain region, but without a way of connecting across that border, it's not very meaningful to say so; it cannot connect to personal experience. So, in my (basically) banter on this before was an attempt is to take a subjective viewpoint and follow it through - because in reality there is no other - to see what intuitive notions of "you", "world" and "consciousness" would be, and whether they could be applied to explaining these people's glitch accounts. (Particularly because if we take "conscious observer" as the starting point, we can dodge the consciousness issue.)

[...]

> > The rest of your comment involves a whole bunch of philosophy and scientifically unexplainable beliefs, which is fine, I just don't like it when people abuse well-defined scientific principles to hand-wavily explain their personal beliefs.

To be fair though, quantum physicists do exactly this all the time (and I've known a few), as soon as they stray from the mathematics and very limited experiments. It comes with the territory on this subject. Scientists love their pseudo-science sci-fi (and sometimes take it as seriously) as much as the lay enthusiast, really. Actual science, on the whole, isn't particularly scientific, in the way that those from the outside imagine it to be. (EDIT: In the sense that it is not really a highly-structured endeavour, following a definite method, coupled with controlled logical thinking. Quantum mechanics itself was a total hack job.)

The whole twisting around to interpret the delayed choice experiment as "retroactively" doing anything is irritating though. If the experiment underlines anything, it's simply that our knowledge of the world is defined by accumulated measurements (*Observation Accumulation*), that new observations will always make logical sense in the terms of previous ones (*Law of Coherence*), and strictly speaking we can't say more than that. Nothing is "violated" except our fantasies about what state things were in prior to being measured. There is no retroactive component because nothing "happens" other than observation. Before quantum mechanics, we could indulge ourselves in a fantasy that we knew *that* something and *what* something was going on between measurements - no more.

To be fair to the general reader also, typically they are learning about "parallel universes" from awful documentaries like the recent BBC Horizon edition, *Which Universe Are We In?*, which actually features Tegmark prominently (mostly playing with Lego, walking about a bit, saying suspect things about the reality of mathematics). Here's the blurb:

> **Which Universe Are We In?**
> Horizon, 2014-2015 Episode 17 of 19
>
> Imagine a world where dinosaurs still walk the earth. A world where the Germans won World War II and you are president of the United States. Imagine a world where the laws of physics no longer apply and where infinite copies of you are playing out every storyline of your life.
>
> It sounds like a plot stolen straight from Hollywood, but far from it. This is the multiverse.
>
> Until very recently the whole idea of the multiverse was dismissed as a fantasy, but now this strangest of ideas is at the cutting edge of science.
>
> And for a growing number of scientists, the multiverse is the only way we will ever truly make sense of the world we are in.
>
> Horizon asks the question: Do multiple universes exist? And if so, which one are we actually in?

It comes over like one of Philomena Cunk's *Moments of Wonder* episodes.

[...]

> > The question is though.. how could the particle at detector 0 have known the random path it's entangled particle was going to take before it took that path?

My suggestion: the detector doesn't "know" anything. Nothing ever "happens" except for observations. In other words, strictly speaking, *no* paths are taken, because "paths" are a narrative we infer based on the results of the experiments, and don't exist other than this.

[...]

Neville was an interesting guy, right enough. His interpretation of the Bible's parables as metaphors which are "an instruction manual for reality" from a certain view, actually makes more sense than all the convoluted attempts to explain them as (rather pointless-seeming) morality tales or historical accounts.

Reply to “I found this interesting.”

Hmm. I was looking into that (gurus, enlightenment, simulations and the like). Info dump:

Alan Watts was a funny one. He was great to read and listen to, and he did say he was a "philosophical entertainer" rather than an actual philosopher or Zen buddhist. A guy who knew him wrote which seems like an honest assessment, excess wives and booze and all!

Thing is though, enlightenment itself doesn't necessarily change your character, apparently. Nisargadatta Maharaj, of *I Am That* fame, ran a tobacco shop for a living and died of throat cancer. Similarly others. All enlightenment is, is seeing that how you think about the world is a fiction, and perceiving that directly. You can do the Douglas Harding experiments in ten minutes and see it for yourself. It won't make you a better person instantly or less grumpy even necessarily, although you might have greater compassion because 'everything seems to be part of you', and it will change your perspective, literally.

This stuff is all fun to think about, and weird experiences are cool, but in the end I think it doesn't matter much. This might all be a dream/simulation, but we're in it and are bound to its rules. We can stop identifying with our "simulation character" though, then treat it as an "experience machine" and revel in it.

> > . . . enlightenment without understanding its coincidence with personal change is like . . . This perception is enlightening, but not enlightenment.

It's a matter of definition though. You can truly understand and experience the nature of the world, but it doesn't necessarily improve your character. That's something you have to work at, perhaps. These are two different things, as I see it. You might be better to call it 'realisation' (seeing clearly how things are) and then something like 'integration' (where you dissolve the boundaries).

You can 'realise' and still have very much a *person-based experience*, but now within a new context. Changing that experience is something you can focus on through self (small 's') examination, although I'd say that change does happen by itself gradually as identification loosens somewhat. Increased connection and so compassion, etc. But it doesn't necessarily mean you're going to be all "pure living", I'd suggest?

I just came across this which had interest, maybe.

- 1. Awakening -> 2. Liberation -> 3. Enlightenment

Where "awakening" would correspond to what I termed "enlightenment" in my post. Achieving a non-dual perspective is not equivalent to 'freedom of the personal self', fair enough.

Reply to “Looking for actual tiny glitches to determine if we live in a Matrix”

> Q1: Something tells me consciousness is the glitch

> Q2: I've been wondering. Is everyone conscious? I am sure that the people that are in your web are, and are aware of their actions... but sometimes when I look out the window of the bus on my way home... I wonder if the people I am seeing are. Their brains operate differently than mine, who is to say their consciousness is the exact same as mine? Are they on their own plane of "auto-pilot" or are they just as sane as I am? It's like the question of "is my blue the same as your blue?"

> Although, in typing this, I may have proved I am not sane after all.

See philosophical zombies and solipsism, but it's not necessarily both. If we each experience a 'dream world' where everyone is a character, then we too in that world are a 'dream character' - we are actually the dreamer and the dream, and "I" and its body is dreamt also. With this approach, everyone is a 'zombie' including you, it's just that you are also the dream viewpoint, through the main 'viewport'. Alternatively, this is shared dream, with most of the people being 'aspects of you' but some of them being viewports for other consciousnesses. This means many dreams, with sometimes only one viewport character - meaning everyone's desired experiences can be accommodated. Note that here we are not just dealing with "your mind" but "the mind", the mind associated with the dream world, or "ideational space", to borrow a lucid dreaming term.

(Re: "Brains" are just images that you see in the dream. Nobody really has, or is run by, a "brain" - only mind/consciousness, which is fundamental.)

> [«A **philosophical zombie** or **p-zombie** in the philosophy of mind and perception is a hypothetical being that is indistinguishable from a normal human being except in that it lacks conscious experience, qualia, or sentience. For example, a philosophical zombie could be poked with a sharp object, and not feel any pain sensation, but yet, behave exactly as if it does feel pain (it may say "ouch" and recoil from the stimulus, or tell us that it is in intense pain). The notion of a philosophical zombie is used mainly in thought experiments intended to support arguments (often called "zombie arguments") against forms of physicalism such as materialism, behaviorism and functionalism. Physicalism is the idea that all aspects of human nature can be explained by physical means: specifically, all aspects of human nature and perception can be explained from a neurobiological standpoint. Some philosophers, like David Chalmers, argue that since a zombie is defined as physiologically indistinguishable from human beings, even its logical possibility would be a sound refutation of physicalism. However, physicalists like Daniel Dennett counter that Chalmers's physiological zombies are logically incoherent and thus impossible.»
>
> «**Solipsism**; (from Latin sōlus 'alone' and ipse 'self') is the philosophical idea that only one's mind is sure to exist. As an epistemological position, solipsism holds that knowledge of anything outside one's own mind is unsure; the external world and other minds cannot be known and might not exist outside the mind. Metaphysical solipsism is a variety of solipsism based on a philosophy of subjective idealism. Metaphysical solipsists maintain that the self is the only existing reality and that all other realities, including the external world and other persons, are representations of that self, having no

independent existence. There are several versions of metaphysical solipsism, such as Caspar Hare's egocentric presentism (or perspectival realism), in which other people are conscious, but their experiences are simply not *present*.»

- Wikipedia: Philosophical Zombie, Solipsism]

Reply to “My Boyfriend is Now Left Handed”

Hmm...

I think you are probably misrepresenting both atheism and science here?

> science has never proven that a Creator doesn't exist.

Science doesn't prove anything and is not intended to - is catalogues observations and creates conceptual frameworks with descriptive and predictive power. Science examines the *content* of experience, it does not examine the *nature* of experience. You argument that it "has never proven that a Creator doesn't exist" is meaningless in those terms, but also because one can't prove something doesn't exist, only that it is logically inconsistent with what has been observed thus far.

> "... cannot hear the music of the spheres.” -Albert Einstein

Many physicists in history (lots of those early 20th century guys) have studied what you might call "mystical traditions" - but the God they refer to is not the "entity god" that common non-philosophical interpretations of religion tend to, but something more like "raw existence", whose properties are the "oms" (omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent) but not in an anthropomorphic way. As this does not refer to a *deity*, it can be compatible with atheism, since really it's just a recognition that "consciousness exists".

> a Creator doesn't exist

If you pursue this line of reasoning, it leads to the conclusion that a creator as such does not exist, since nothing can be created - only *creation* exists. Consciousness would be "before" division and multiplicity and time and so could never create anything.

> Both sides allegedly have no proof then why not err on the side of caution then?

That means I could raise any unfalsifiable claim where the penalty in not believing it was unpleasant - and you'd have to go along with it "just in case". It's really not a good line of reasoning to follow. You'll be spending your days with paper plates on your head in case the spaghetti monster rains down his pasta apocalypse - etc. ;-)

Meanwhile, the Mandela Effect doesn't prove multiple worlds/timelines - it can equally be used as evidence for, say, the philosophy of subjective idealism and that idea that patterns of the mind are unstable. You have to separate out the experience from the potential descriptions for that experience. Since we can't *test* our descriptions, basically it's a narrative fiction we're engaging in - there is no provable truth of the matter.

> This is what is referred to as "scientific proof."

We have to be a little careful here. For instance, there is no such thing as a photon really *as such* - it's an abstraction. Scientific proof doesn't not prove the existence of anything; rather it is a confirmation of the self-consistency of a description. Beware the reification of abstractions, and all that.

Science could never prove there is a creator or disprove it - it can certainly disprove a hypothesis by making an observation whose content is inconsistent with that hypothesis. If a falsifiable hypothesis is not made - i.e. a prediction is made that can be confirmed or not - then science can say nothing about it. Science doesn't deal in truth.

> And about the mandela effect. Your point would only be valid on an individual basis. When thousands of people are reporting the same accounts, it is clear that it is much more than "subjective idealism."

Well, subjective idealism asserts that all experience is in mind and that there is only one mind, so there would be no "thousands of people". Actually, it would be the ideal explanation for Mandela Effects, if you're willing to give up the notion of an external objective universe and take a "private view" of reality - which even some recent interpretations of quantum physics are doing these days, actually.

How *exactly* does the Mandela Effect suggest that timelines (which are really just *diagrams* we use for conceptual thinking, after all; they have never been real things) exist, or that God exists?

> From what I gather you are basically making some sort of philosophical argument.

Well, physics *is* basically: observations + philosophy.

It's "course-corrected philosophy" and optimisation of abstractions. And it's important to remember which way round things are: observations are primary, connective fictions are secondary. The reason I bring it up, which *does* sound nitpicking but really is not, is that when we are talking of things like "timelines" or "many-worlds", we are talking *only* about the philosophical aspect because the observational aspect cannot distinguish between the interpretations. "Many-worlds", of instance, is inherently non-scientific. And neither is the (better, in my view) suggestion that world is not formatted in the same way as our spatial sensory experience, and we might put together an attentional or pattern-selection description of the unusual experiences instead.

> Clearly there is not "one mind" as all the accounts would line up to reflect one mind.

You have a dream one night - it's a dream about a board meeting, where you are going to decide once and for all what the definitive map of the world should be. However, each of the dream characters at the meeting offers a different suggestion for the relative locations of continents, backing it up with stories of their experiences. But wait... surely they are all in one mind - yours? How can they report different experiences?

Anyway, let's not get too off topic!

Coming back to my questions (which are to seed discussion, they are not a challenge):

- How *exactly* does the Mandela Effect suggest that timelines exist?
- How *exactly* does the Mandela Effect suggest that God exists?

Science and Philosophy

> Physics is not observations + philosophy.

I think it's a pretty snappy summary, myself! Oh well. I'm with George Ellis and N David Mermin on this stuff, mostly.

As I'm sure you know, Schrodinger's thought experiment was intended to demonstrate the ridiculousness of the Copenhagen interpretation. Quantum mechanics is a *mathematical* theory - literally, given a defined situation it gives you a list of potential outcomes along with an "intensity" for each (which some interpret as a "probability"). When you make the measurement, one of those outcomes will be observed. Everything else

(including "wave function collapse") is interpretation. Which is fine - - - but if there is no way to distinguish between the various interpretations by observation, then we are in the realm of pure philosophy, not science. That doesn't mean it's not valuable or useful - it doesn't devalue it at all - it's just being clear about the type of knowledge and investigation we are dealing with.

Dream Analogy

> The dream analogy you used is not applicable. We are not talking about dreams. I've also had the capability to fly in a dream and fought off a monster with 10 heads, how is that applicable to reality?

The applicability is that you are assuming that because you have experiences of other people reporting similar or dissimilar experiences to you, that this means that they cannot all be arising in one mind, as per the view in subjective idealism. I'm not pushing the point really - just indicating that "seeing people say different things" doesn't contradict this.

Flying or monsters in dreams is neither here nor there - I've had plenty of dreams which correspond to his mundane experience now. In terms of the *nature* of experience, waking and dreaming are indistinguishable. They differ only in their *content* (although often not really) and that we have experienced "waking up" and apparently have memories.

I mean, it is undeniable at this moment that *your entire experience* is arising within your mind, right? And that you have no access to anything outside of your mind, yes?

Mandela Effect Theorising

> A better question to your question would be how does the mandela effect suggest that different timelines DO NOT exist.

It's not a better question at all! I could simply retort: "how does the Mandela Effect suggest that subjective idealism is not the true nature of your experience?"

If we start with the *actual observation*, what do we have?

1. One day you had an experience (say, encountering a Wiki article about real animals called narwhals) which contradicted a specific memory of the world (reading a book about mythical creatures called narwhals).
2. Subsequently, searching for physical evidence to support your prior memory, you can find only thing which support narwhals as being real, and none which support the mythical status.
3. In conversation in person and online, although most people say they knew about narwhals being real, a substantial number of people also say that *they* thought narwhals were mythical, and are surprised to discover they are real animals.

From here, you are suggesting that what happened is you moved somehow from a "dimension" where narwhals were fictional, to a dimension where narwhals are real.

So we have some questions:

- What further evidence supports the dimension-jumping hypothesis? Did you actually experience this happening?
- Have you ever *seen* a timeline or a dimension? Or is all of your evidence of the form: "certain of my memories and the world do not correspond anymore"?
- What *exactly* would be the transfer mechanism? Are physical bodies moving between places? What form does a "dimension" take?

Note - I am actually sympathetic to idea of the "effect" and so on; I am just seeking a full exploration and justification for a particular view. I'm not convinced that timelines are the best approach.

The Blink of an Eye

> So unless all of that was created with a blink of an eye...

Well, there's the thing. That is only a problem because you are viewing the world (or "dimensions") as persistent places - seeing the world as a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time". This is not necessarily the case. What you *actually* experience, is observation then observation then observation, always in the present moment. Even if you have an observation "about" the past, such as finding an old book about narwhal expeditions, it occurs in **The Now**.

The only reason the world seems to be a persistent "place" is because, generally, our observations tend to arise consistently with previous observations - the implied facts of what we have seen before, seem to form the foundations of subsequent experience. However, this is not necessarily a hard rule. The world is not necessarily "happening" outside of our observations; only observations "happen". (This is one of the possible interpretations of the Delayed Choice Experiment: a reminder that our story of what happens between observations, doesn't *actually* happen, it is a connective fiction.)

So this leads us to the possibility of the Mandela Effect being a result of a *state change*, a shift from one coherent self-consistent state to another, with all subsequent observations being in alignment with the resulting state, except for personal memory. You don't *go* anywhere; it is actually the patterning of your own mind that shifts.

Reply to “11:11 -the numbers in my life for over 25 years”

[[OP (a fag): I want to preface this by saying I have heard every established theory on this from "you are subconsciously prompting yourself to look at a clock" to "it is the gateway opening of the age of Aquarius and we must dress in white robes and do a dance in Ireland." Nothing fits, nothing helps. I am very much a skeptic and although I always keep an open mind, I also first seek the most rational explanation to anything. If you can accept I don't take these things lightly, read on. It started very simply. I saw 11:11 on the clock and thought something about seemed interesting. I don't know what. A mirror of 2 numbers? Four towers? I can't say, but everyone has bombarded me with these explanations. All I know is, I noticed it and something felt odd about it.

And then I saw it again.

And again. and again. Eventually, it was happening with such frequency that I can honestly say I started to think it was alarming. Why was I seeing this? Well, I shrugged it off nonetheless. After a year of this, I made a new friend who is still the closest friend I have to this day. We go beyond friends, beyond family. One day she timidly asked me if I had ever heard of anyone seeing 11:11 on the clock repeatedly. Needless to say, the hairs on the back of my neck stood up. Over the course of I'd say 5 years, we both saw it with alarming regularity. But we both came to the same conclusion; it doesn't mean anything at all but rather we are very aware of time and we are subconsciously prompting ourselves to look when it's 11:11. That makes a lot of sense, really, because many times when I set me alarm to wake up early, I will wake up a minute or two before the alarm goes off. Subconsciously, we all have an internal clock, so it makes sense that we were just making ourselves see it. That explanation satisfied us for many years.

And then it got harder to deny.

Several years later, after life took us in separate directions, I was living on the whole other end of the state. A few years in, I was rummaging around in my closet and found a wristwatch of mine I had misplaced months before. It had wound down and was not running any more. I squinted to look in surprise. It had stopped at 11:11:11. Precisely. I also lived alone, and was not in the habit of telling anyone about what I saw, so I don't see that anyone else could have done such a thing. The only person who knew was many miles away and had been since before I bought the watch. But, I still shrugged it off. I was driving down the street one night and the local bank had a digital sign that displayed the time. This night, it read 11:11. I chuckled and then my eyes darted to the clock on my car. It was 8:24. I can totally see the clock breaking. It could even blink 12:00 like an old VCR after a power outage. But 11:11? Why?

About 8 years ago I sat with a dear friend in Denny's at the wee hours of the morning. The place was empty except for us and the staff. I told him all my stories about 11:11 as we were swapping strange life experiences. He was dubious, of course, and offered the "subconscious prompting" explanation as most people do but I explained too many instances were piling up that I had no power to influence. He chuckled and shrugged it off. Well, sadly he has passed on since then. He had a variety of illnesses, not the least of which was ketoacidosus which finally claimed his life. As a result of his illnesses, he always had to rush to the restroom after meals and this time was no different. I had already paid the check so I said I'd go with him. On the way, I stopped dead in my tracks and grabbed his shirt. "Look at THAT" I said. There, on the wall, the wall we were both looking at from our tables, the wall NO ONE had gone near while we were in there, was a wall full of

grafitti all saying the same thing. 11:11, 11:11, 11:11. "Did I subconsciously write that with my mind or did I subconsciously prompt us to visit the only place in the area with this on the wall," I teased. That was the first time he took it seriously.

A couple of years ago or so I had the experience that frightened me. I had moved a bunch of stuff out of my office when I moved out of it and frankly left some of it lingering around the back of my car for about a year. Lazy, sure, but that doesnt matter. What matters is I had a large digital clock in there that had been on my desk. One day I opened the trunk and saw it. It was face down. I laughed inwardly. "You know if you turn it over what it will say, right?" I teased myself. I really didn't believe it, though. And then I picked it up. To my relief, it was blinking 12:00 like any good clock should when it's not properly set. I heaved a sigh of relief. And with that, the alarm on it suddenly rang and the numbers changed to 11:11 11:11 11:11. And then -it powered off, dead, never to work again.

Let me say, with all of the grace and dignity I can muster, that I nearly shit my pants. That's not something I can prompt. That's not something I influenced. It was here, in my hands, happening independently of me.

a bit over 3 years ago, my mother fell terribly ill. Turned out to be a massive tumor outside her brain in the netting that holds the brain in place, called the Meninges. (The cancer is called a Meningioma). The surgery went awry, and after an emergency second surgery to relieve an infection, she has been left an invalid, barely able to form sentences. It's very sad, let's not go there. But the reason I bring this is up is because a few weeks ago I was visiting her and she kept repeating "one." "one." "one." "one." I asked her nurse what this was all about and she smiled. "Oh, she must have seen the clock. She has this thing where she keeps seeing 11:11 on the clock." Mom smiled and managed a "yes!" And of course my blood ran cold. I had never told her about this.

So what conclusion can I draw? I saw it earlier today and I saw it again last night. Is the universe trying to tell me something? Maybe, but if so, it really, really sucks at it and if the universe has this capability it might just resort to words as that would be a lot more expressive. But this is all I get. 11:11.

I'd say about maybe around 2003-ish, I had decided to poke around on the net and see if anyone else had ever seen this. To my shock, I found *millions* of people had. Alas, they had no better explanation than I. "It means it's time to make a wish!" Hogwash. "It means the angels are with you." Preposterous. My favorite has to be on a website called Solara the Nvisible which talked about elaborate druidic dances called "master cylinders" (isnt that a car part lol?) and all of this aerie faerie stuff. Not a shred of hope of answers from that lot. And obviously I completely reject the subconscious prompting notion to say nothing of the pure coincidence idea. No way I can have this many coincidences over this many years.

But that clock in my car. It made me think. I drove on my way and mulled it over. I cannot have affected that clock in any way that could produce that effect upon lifting it. This was *external to myself*. I cannot have used the psychic powers I dont have -I dont believe anyone has them, it's just wishful thinking. So how do I explain it?

The unavoidable answer is that nothing is real. That somehow an external force can affect reality and is doing it for others and for me. Well, what the fuck does THAT mean? I don't believe in gods. I cannot say I completely disbelieve in psychics, I suppose, only because I myself have had too many experiences where I have known the unknowable right before it happened -but that is another glitch report. But no matter what else I've experienced, I am certainly not going to believe someone was using mind-powers to do this to me.

Not rational. It was a glitch in the matrix. A sign that the impossible was possible because that should never have been able to happen -but it did, just the same.

Now, mind you, I don't go around thinking "nothing is real and we're in the matrix." What I mean to say is that I can think of no better explanation to fit the facts -but I still reject it. There has to be a better theory but no amount of "you're doing it yourself" or "dance the master cylinder" is going to work for me either. At this time I have to say I have no theory I firmly believe but will always, always be looking for one. I'm not prone to hallucinating, most of these have been corroborated by other witnesses, and I certainly didn't dream it all. And the examples I have given here are a drop in the bucket for a nearly 30 year long experience.

All I really can say is I don't know what it is -but it's something and it doesn't happen for no reason. I am just unwilling to give a pat answer just to satisfy myself. I will keep wondering and looking and thinking. And no doubt, I will keep seeing it.]]

. . .

Self-reinforcing synchronicity. The more it happens, the more you decide to attend to it, the deeper the impression, the more you are mind-formatting your reality. There's no inherent meaning; but it does reveal something interesting about the nature of experience eh.

See also *The Patterning of Experience*.

> > OP: You clearly only skimmed what I wrote. But thank you for proposing the same tired theory Ive heard for decades that has no bearing on the evidence I submitted. I sort of expected this.

No, *you* clearly only skimmed. What I describe isn't Bader-Meinhoff or the like. By "formatting your mind" I don't mean you are pattern-searching. You are not filtering experience from *what is there*; you are filtering experience from *all possibilities*. Read it properly before moping or thinking you're special. ;-)

I adjusted the link phrasing a little to make that clearer.

> > OP: I'm neither moping nor special. in fact, bringing up a theory someone has heard a thousand times before makes you the one who thinks they've hit on something special and original! It doesnt fit my experiences. But thanks for the suggestion. Again.

Really, so what is the theory I'm proposing? You definitely didn't read those links. I'm suggesting that you have accidentally selected your future *events* according to a pattern, *formatted your own future path*, to an extreme degree. There is no power outside of you making it happen. The more you encounter a pattern, the more you notice a pattern, the stronger the selection is. The pattern affects things 4-dimensionally, even though you only encounter it one moment at a time. You end up looking around just at the *exact moment* a pattern is there. Reading material and conversations are centred around the pattern. *Actually are centred around the pattern* - it's not just a case of you noticing. Numbers are the easily recognised one, but any pattern or relationship behaves the same way, once you get into it.

The implication? That your experiences and thoughts actually *select* your later experiences. The inevitable conclusion is that you to some extent live in your own private universe - a subjective idealist reality - which is effectively an extension to your own mind. And the more you focus, the more you end up in situations which give you more of the same.

Seriously, I don't mean to be snippy. What you are experiencing is what *genuine* full-effect synchronicity looks like. I've been generating it deliberately lately. It's like cutting a whole in your reality filter and suddenly new sets of events, new parts of the universe, manage to leak through.

> > OP: Look, when I tell you I know these theories already, I'm not putting it lightly. I don't believe in the synchronicity thing and I see no rational evidence anywhere that I have any ability to influence future events. This requires an almost supernatural belief in things that can't be proven. I do appreciate the attempt, believe me, but it doesnt work for me.

Well, synchronicity is maybe not a great term for it, given its misuse these days, but there's not really a better term I'm aware of. By synchronicity I mean "collections of experiences arising over time which are of the same pattern". And it's not an explanation, it's an observation of a pattern. Look, I've tried everything in this area too and after experimenting with it, and as far as I can see any *useable* model requires that we introduce some temporal landscape concept. Although we experience things moment-by-moment, that's not how it's laid out behind the scenes. I know:

- It's not hallucination.
- If you deliberately attempt to create synchronicity, you can.
- It *seems* like pattern-selection in a 4D environment.

It's not supernatural. It's not God. It's not other beings. It's not a simulation. It's not "you" in the sense of making deliberate choices. It's not influencing future events as such. It's more like simple, mechanical, automatic perceptual pattern filtering across space-time.

I'm not downvoting. Never do. And I see you took this personally.

To me it's just an interesting phenomenon that most people have to some extent, and it seems we can deliberately increase its occurrence (and I've been getting people to do that). I guess it's been a bit more meaningful in your life than that - so perhaps I seemed offhand and disrespectful. Apologies if so (sincerely).

> > Ok, show me the scientific evidence that this sentence is true.

As you'll have noticed, there is no way to measure this objectively other than through the experiences of people, so designing a study is problematic (I've considered doing this). At the moment it's restricted to personal investigation. But, why don't you (by which I mean "everyone") do your own experimentation? It's easy to do. Choose a particular pattern, get really absorbed in it, notice how it appears in ways that can't be explained by just noticing stuff, notice how it is self-reinforcing. The best fit *so far* that fits the experience and isn't "the matrix did it" is there is some filtering process going on. Others (Dr Surprise) have proposed that a model based on string theory might be able to account for it *in principle* because it can take in the higher dimensional component. I find it a bit of a stretch, personally.

> > OP: I'm not ignoring you, I have to dash out for awhile. I will adress further posts of yours later. Look, I dont want to make an enemy of you and I have no wish to fight or have it devolve into insults as happens too often on reddit. I just see it differently. I can get that you can make a self-fulfilling prophecy. The man who is convinced he is going to die will find a way to make it happen. Look at Jim Carey. Wrote himself a check for a million or something and kept it in his wallet, believing one day it would be real, one day he'd have a success big enough to match it. And then he did. He claims it was

> synchronicity. I say he gave himself the confidence and that confidence made the difference. But that's totally different than affecting electronic devices or graffiti on walls.

Yeah, that's why "synchronicity" has become a difficult word for this, it's got all these connotations. What I'm using it to describe is just the basic observation: *Similar patterns arise repeatedly over time, in both thought and senses, in ways that seem unconnected except that they have the same pattern.*

The "matrix" explanation does have the idea we need, which is: That behind the moment-by-moment sensory experience we have, there's a larger world. This doesn't need to be some supernatural or computer based thing, though. Philosophers have previously suggested views that offer the same essential idea (Immanuel Kant, to an extent George Berkeley, etc). The basic idea being:

- There is *the world as it really is*.
- There is *our experience of the world*.
- The form of our experience isn't necessarily the same as the world as it truly is.

In Kant's description, things like space and time are part of the senses. It is the mind that formats the world into "spaces" and "moments". The world as it is, is all-at-once and everything-everywhere. Just a load of "facts" dissolved into the background. From Wikipedia:

> ‘The salient element here is that space and time, rather than being real things-in-themselves or empirically mediated appearances (German: Erscheinungen), are the very forms of intuition (German: Anschauung) by which we must perceive objects. They are hence neither to be considered properties that we may attribute to objects in perceiving them, nor substantial entities of themselves. They are in that sense subjective, yet necessary, preconditions of any given object insofar as this object is an appearance and not a thing-in-itself. Humans necessarily perceive objects as located in space and in time. This condition of experience is part of what it means for a human to cognize an object, to perceive and understand it as something both spatial and temporal. . .
>
> . . .Kant's view is better characterized as a two-aspect theory, where noumena [world as it is] and phenomena [world as sensed] refer to complementary ways of considering an object.’
>
> -- *Transcendental Idealism*, Wikipedia

This opens the possibility that just as patterns arise across a spatial environment and our mind picks them out (that's what seeing objects really is), so patterns can appear across time and our mind picks *them* out (that's what events are).

Most of the assumptions we make about our perception being direct are obviously wrong but we never really notice. It's only when "crazy things" seem to happen that we realise there must be more going on. That applies to spatial environments - can the same be true of the 'temporal environment'?

Are we effectively pre-filtering "moments of experience" that correspond to patterns? We don't do this *deliberately* though, it's just an automatic thing. The more you are exposed to a pattern, the more your "perceptual filter" lets that in. The illusion of time passing makes us think that it's a miracle.

In a way, saying "it's the matrix" isn't all that bad if what we're really saying is: The universe is actually made from dimensionless information, and we navigate it by pattern searching. We don't *cause* the future, it's just a natural filtering mechanism that makes it seem to line up.

Just to add, the idea behind this subreddit is to "explore together" to find interesting and useful explanations for odd things, whether based on current knowledge or left-field thinking. Very few people are here just to be "right". Most are just here to be interested/ing.

> If that were possible, I could have altered reality hundreds of times in my favor.

Yeah, I'm with you there.

You *can* filter your experiences that correspond to your thoughts (it seems) - and unlikely examples might then take place - but that's not the same as creating them. You are just filtering what's already there. I've played quite a lot with trying to make things happen. You can make your life appear to fit patterns, but that's different to summoning a nice new Ferrari out of thin air. I do see owls everywhere though.

[...]

> OP: I think most people dismiss things they have investigated before and come up with a dead end from. If you want to color that as moping, that's on you. Not me.

Well, given my first comment was a kinda enthusiastic one (basically I was saying "you too!", check this out) and I basically agreed with you, your response was kinda crap - especially since you obviously don't really get the idea behind it. The fact that you seem to have concluded that something *external to yourself* causes it is... a sign that you really haven't experimented properly with it and got to grips with the subtleties. It doesn't take much work to prove that's not the case.

[...]

Never go against the feeling. And choose your answers carefully.

Reply to “Insane high. Was literally told we're in a matrix.”

> > I got this huge feeling that we WEREN'T in a matrix similar to that in the movie. But that the whole concept of 'the matrix' was the only way to communicate to me what was really going on.

I think this is key. We are *not* living in a simulation - but there is not metaphor which encompasses it properly. It's something more like a dream, but it's maybe more accurate to say that "dreams" and "waking life" are both different instances of "this same thing".

That dreams obviously appear "within you" even though you seem to be a body inside them, is their main benefit in the comparison (the idea that we "take on the shape of experience"). The love and connectedness we encounter in these moments is not the finding of something; it's the *falling away* of the waking experience, revealing the background-that-is-you to be undivided and welcoming of everything.

It's something even more like having a "strand of thought" which has become immersive - in much the same way as a thought-scene in hypnogogia suddenly "snaps-to" and becomes an immersive environment.

This means that the *content* of our experiences doesn't really matter. We tend to look at the content in our search for a "mechanism" which underlies reality - but I'm tending to think that reality is much more simple that that. The actual visuals and situations don't matter so much as the meaning of those experiences *relative to other experiences...* with no solid underlying beneath it.

I say: it's not like *The Matrix* matrix, because that matrix has an underlying infrastructure to support it which is of a different type to the perceived environment. It also implies a separate control scheme and external laws and some sort of "purpose".

Yeah, the same thing crops up in most religions (although it seems to then get re-interpreted in other ways for moral/control purposes, obscuring the core lesson: reality is flexible and responsive). *The idea I like...*

Maybe our situation is an "illusion" because although it appears that we are people in a spatially-extended world unfolding in time, it's more like:

- (As said before) The apparent world is actually a strand of thought *about* being a person in a world - albeit a very bright 3D/4D multi-sensory immersive thought.
- There is no solid substrate supporting this apparent world, there's nothing "behind" the experience. The room you are in now *is* the sight, sound, texture of that room. Just as in George Berkeley's philosophy a "vase" is just the collection of all the overlapping observations or patterns which are clustered around "vase-ness".

That means the world is basically a large stack of *ideas* that have become intermingled, complex and stabilised. An accumulation of observations that have come to define a fictional world?

This fits in with the John Wheeler Delayed Choice Experiment (observation defines the "fact" of something) as well as various magickal traditions (altered states to allow change the world) and early Christian teachings (parables describing the relationship of mind and reality) and New Thought stuff (the world is made from imagination).

The common thread? Observations define reality, and it doesn't matter whether those observations are "external" (sensory) or "internal" (thought) because in fact they are both the same thing (image-ination in consciousness). *Your mileage may vary...*

[...]

> [Q: My mileage has been doing pretty well actually. Weird things are afoot in this reality.
>
> Nothing extremely notable...but, I've been working on manifesting intentions under the theory that this world is somehow a manifestation of our own intrinsic awareness and directed thoughts. And so far I've been three for three whenever I've explicitly applied myself to it. The latest was a couple weeks ago at the casino. (What better place, right?) I wanted to see if I could manifest winning for the sake of experiment (rather than gain). It seems to me that it's not conscious intent that does it. You can't just "want it" really bad. Rather you must somehow communicate to the subconscious (or whatever you want to call it) - to that part that is "you" but not this mere physical you. Somehow I ended up with this self-semi-hypnotic suggestion where I told myself and felt that "the universe wants me to win".
>
> Five dollars and a five pulls later on the slots, I cashed out $100 ahead.
>
> I also wonder if this fulfilled a second intention where I was believing that a stolen piece of equipment would be returned...I used the winnings to buy a replacement. Don't know if that counts, but the money covered the cost exactly. Thing is, I've been careful to apply this intent thing sparingly. I want to keep track of bias and also don't want to mire myself in a web of conflicting potential manifestations. So this isn't like I've been blasting away and cherry picking the successful results.
>
> Have you had this experience? I'm still cautiously experimenting with it.]

Nice work! Interesting that it might amount to a mix of several intentions coming together to fulfil themselves.

I've been playing with *world-as-thought* for a while as a way to create deliberate synchronicity and therefore particular scenes. The worldview I've been using is a variation on this:

- You are an "open conscious space" in which thoughts arise. The apparent world is basically a very bright, stable, full 3D-sensory immersive strand of thought.
- The world evolves by the accumulation of observations or "facts".
- Every thought you have about the world is *literally* adding a new fact to the world.
- Thoughts which randomly arise simply reveal the current state of the world.
- If you deliberately think a thought, then you are deliberately adding a new fact to the world. (This is how to make changes.)
- The more intense the thought, the stronger the influence of that “fact” upon your experience.
- If you respond emotionally to a random thought, then you are in effect re-thinking it as a more intense thought, meaning it will contribute more. (Hence fearful thoughts tend to increase the prevalence of fear-related experiences; however this works just as well for nice-emotion thoughts.)

- If you “grasp” onto a thought then you are persisting it - you are maintaining it at its present level of intensity and not letting it fade and be “forgotten”.
- Things such as detachment, surrender, abandoning yourself, and so on, are all about letting the current dominant thoughts or “facts” become softer, allowing others to take their place.

Which means that the method of creating change or future experiences amounts to "observing it to exist" - creating "fake" observations! In other words, imagine into awareness a sensory experience which implies a desired situation to be a fact - the "brighter" that thought, the more impact it has.

Even just stating a fact in words can have an effect. "The universe wants me to win" is good enough.

As you say though, you have to do this pretty sparingly, because it means that every deliberate thought or emotional response to a random thought is a direct interaction with the *facts-of-the-world* and is rebalancing them. I think the main "trick" becomes not the asserting of facts, but detaching and withdrawing emotional connection to contrary thoughts/experiences so that they can fade. You have to be in a state of "allowing" so that the world can shift easily in the direction of your assertion.

I've never tried the casino though. Have you read about Ian Wilson's casino adventures? He was trying a similar thing with "the law of attraction" but I don't think he ever sussed the underlying "mechanism" of it.

[[Q2: You two might be interested in the teachings of Neville Goddard. He wrote about "creating reality;" though, I don't think he used that exact phrase. He was a forerunner of the new age movement, teaching in the 1950s, and he doesn't use the new age jargon of today... "vibrations," "alignment," and all that other woo-woo bull shit. Goddard uses and teaches a 3 step process.

> “The first step in changing the future is Desire, that is, define your objective — know definitely what you want.”
>
> “Second: construct an event which you believe you would encounter FOLLOWING the fulfillment of your desire – an event which implies fulfillment of your desire – something which will have the action of Self predominant.”

For example, in your casino experiment, this basically means you would imagine some event that would imply you've won money. Imagine the bells going off on the machine and people congratulating you. The key point here is to imagine this scenario from your POV; that is, from your eyes. Don't construct a scenario in which you're observing yourself as a bystander.

> “The third step is to immobilize the physical body and induce a state akin to sleep. Then mentally feel yourself right into the proposed action, imagine all the while that you are actually performing the action HERE AND NOW. You must participate in the imaginary action, not merely stand back and look on, but FEEL that you are actually performing the action, so that the imaginary sensation is real to you.”

I have had some success with this technique. For instance, when I had to give a class presentation, I imagined my professor giving me a thumbs up after the presentation. Also, a friend of mine said I was going to give a fantastic presentation.

After I gave the presentation, I did indeed get the thumbs up from my professor, and he used the word "fantastic" at least three times. I have other examples, but that was the most recent.]]

Yes! I've read his stuff and that was a really nice summary. He's probably the nearest to my "literally imagined world" take: your experience right now is literally a thought *about* being a person in a world, etc. As described elsewhere in *The Patterning of Experience*.

Neville produced so much output though that I think people get overwhelmed and put off, and some dislike what appears to be religious talk (but is in fact not). I've been pointing interested people to *Imagination Creates Reality* for the general picture and *The Pruning Shears of Revision* for further context.

I love how he (your professor) actually said "fantastic". :-)

It's experiences like that which led me to view reality as being super-basic. The world has no depth and there is no behind-the-scenes goings-on. You are essentially injecting sensory "frames" of experience, activating patterns within your perspective.

> The ideas you've expressed are pretty similar to Goddard's.

Yeah, the truth is the truth, I suppose: there are a million ways to say the same thing and none of them *are* that thing. I only really understood where exactly Goddard was coming from once I'd worked through it. Which is why I try to get people to just experiment directly: if you directly *assert* this is an open imagination space, *only then* will you have the experience of it being so, etc, and then all the words about it will make obvious sense.

> Maybe I'm tired, but I had a really hard time wrapping my head around everything you wrote.

I wouldn't worry about it, frankly! The essence of it is in the comment a couple of replies up. Everything else is yet more metaphor, tailored to particular audiences who want to achieve particular things. All I think we need to realise is that *nothing is fundamental* and that *facts can be asserted*.

> [Reality is super-basic] I'm inclined to agree which begs the question: what is the point? :)

Haha, yes. For adventure! For great justice! :-) That's a common question, right? If it's not "real" then what's the point? But do we really think that stuff simply being "made from atoms" makes it somehow inherently more important and meaningful? I suggest that worldview is the *opposite* of meaningful, and contrary to purpose. What the alternative outlook ("the world is imagination") tells us is that our world is *predominantly about meaning*. If we take the usual example of "a vase":

- *In the Standard Worldview* - What we call "a vase" is a collection of atoms in a particular arrangement. Upon seeing a vase, we may be prompted to have many thoughts about times we have seen similar made-of-atoms vases - but that's just silly mind stuff. The *real* vase is there on the table; everything else is unimportant.
- *In the Revised Worldview* - What we call "a vase" *actually is* the overlapping, interconnected thoughts about that vase and all other vases, including its appearance, texture, history, emotional meaning. A "vase" *is* the triggering into experience of a vast seamless vase-pattern which is itself an unbroken continuation of the larger world-pattern. A "vase" is completely subjective and therefore completely meaningful.

In the Revised Worldview, in other words, the purpose is to have an adventure of exploration, an associative traversal of a memory of a world which has no limits. It really is "all about you".

Yes, I took that question far too seriously. ;-)

[...]

[[Q: *"I think the main "trick" becomes not the asserting of facts, but detaching and withdrawing emotional connection to contrary thoughts/experiences so that they can fade."*; There's something to this - withdrawing emotionally. For whatever reason, I think emotion interferes. Perhaps its the animal portion of the brain functioning too strongly. I'll look at that casino adventures. I don't think you'd be able to continually win at a casino, however, since you'd still have to obey the statistical probabilities porgrammed into the slots...and physical distribution of the card decks. Plus, in my theory, you'd have to wrestle with other people's intentions in a game of roulette.]]

Hmm. I think emotion could be viewed the same as other parts of a "thought". If you hold onto any part of a state, it prevents the shifting of that state, retriggers it, persists it. There's nothing special about the "feeling" aspect to experience in that regard, except that it can't be easily conceptualised (captured in language or illustrations).

I don't think you need to worry about probabilities as such - there is no programming or deck distribution beyond your observing of it - it's more about how much you are willing to break your reality, approaching an increasingly private view as the plausibility level drops. But then we're getting into "sharing models".

Here's something though, an easy test: Imagine yourself sat at a card table, willing the required cards, willing the behavior of other people, gradually approaching *directing the whole scene* - at what level of control does it feel uncomfortable or abhorrent to you?

Even if we are in a simply-shared world (i.e. we are actual "people" bound to a single consensus environment) then very few people know how directing change works. They either think *about* it (as an abstract concept or in 3rd-person) or they formulate it incorrectly (like "I wish I would win", which is implicitly request for a situation which supports continued wishing). So I think a knowledgable person who understood attentional detachment and open intention would prevail.

> Also, as you said, holding onto the idea perpetuates its existence as an idea - rather than a reality. In any case, seems that letting go is the way to go.

Yes. I think it depends on how you are intending. But you certainly need to detach from present experience to allow it to shift (otherwise it's like trying to move a muscle while tensing it in place) and if you keep re-asserting the *start* of an idea then you are resetting it (you want to stand up, but every time you intend to do so, you begin be re-imagining being sat down as your start point).

> The second point is when he mentions how playing with other people alongside messes things up.

Right, and this is the bit I'm not sure of. Now I know that you *can* affect other people and that the world often *does* behave as if it is a "private view" - however it's probably an area where we're more vulnerable to our ideas about what the world is like and what people are. Underlying beliefs might really mess with being consciously intentional here?

> Perhaps the statistic distributions don't matter. Perhaps you could skew them enough if they did. How are those things supposed to work anyway? Are they all linked to a true RNG? How does the casino bias the percentage payouts if they are?

Yeah, it ain't RNG. But I'm going to suggest something: I think it's better if you don't go looking for information on how they are [meant] to work. Because what you are *actually* doing if you do this is, you are creating an "observation" that they work "this way" which becomes a "fact" you are going to have to then overcome. As much as possible (I'm thinking) you should try and see the casino games as *literally* an image floating in your mental space with no mechanism or agency behind them. I have a feeling that the more you can reduce what they are to just "mirages" with no depth, the easier it might become.

> You can **think about** standing up, but at some point you have to stop thinking and just do it. The essential act is indescribable as a thought.

Yes, although I mean something more specific actually: not *thinking-about* but *thinking-to*.

So if sitting down *is* the immersive 1st-person 3D thought of sitting down (Experiential State A), and standing up *is* the immersive 1st-person 3D thought of standing up (Experiential State B) - then the only way to switch from one to the other is to allow A to fade and allow B to become "bright". To **think to** the next state.

In this description, both states are always present, it's just a case of how much each is contributing right now (their "brightness", relative intensities). If you rethink A then you are making it "bright" again and returning to it as your dominant experience.

For a 3rd-person example, imagine a door which is closed (in state A). Now, mentally open the door (to state B). Great! Note, though that every time you imagine the door as being closed you have reset that particular door-thought to state A. This is the same way as you interact with the world, and how we end up undoing our intentions be re-imagining them in the initial state.

Lesson: Always imagine things in the final state, never in the initial state or in the process of change (this is the origin of the instruction to forget, and to not worry about the path that results will take).

> Example - you might inject the idea of being hungry into a co-worker but not be able to change a hard set pessimistic world view or their strange preference for a particularly ugly tie.

Well, the mood and dress sense things are exactly the sorts of things you can do, is the fun!

Since all you are truly intending for is a particular sensory experience that *implies* a fact, then there should be no limits here. If I imagine meeting my colleague and him having a fashionable tie, cheerfully enthusing about it, then I am literally inserting that "movie frame" into my future experience. There is no "depth" to the request as such.

However, the *Law of Coherence* dictates that subsequent observations must be consistent with previous observations, so from that point on my colleague's apparent narrative arc must fit in with this experience. Subsequent *Observation Accumulation* will further entrench that change into persistent habit and hence "fact".

If I'm a bit smarter, when I do the imagining I will also declare that "seeing this *means-that* my colleague is now a happy and fashionable chap" and thereby make that *feeling-knowing* part of the image. (Otherwise there are many other plausible narratives.)

> Although this assumes other people are a bit more than just a projection of our own awareness. :)

Ah-ha, but surely the trick is that *we* are projections of our own awareness too? Just because the 3D sensory experience happens to be from a particular perspective (the Scroon's Eye View!) doesn't mean that's what you "are"!

Your perspective may be apparently local, but your intentions are global. And in fact, I'd say there is no spatially-extended world at all other than your imagining of it, and therefore: local == global. Whew! :-)

> So, we should probably apply this to all of reality as well. Hmm, another slight feeling of fear. Do we dare take that step to accepting reality as a frightfully thin illusion?

I know the fear thing. Hmm, can I offer a little exercise to try? Maybe something to do before the next casino trip?

As an aspect of your awareness, you can trust me to keep you safe, honest. Unless of course, I am a self-destructive part of your personality - in which case you're screwed! ;-)

> [Wishing] And that's a state of expectation, not becoming. We just need to allow the state to happen in order for it to manifest.

Yes, that's how I see it. If we keep in mind the idea that a deliberate multi-sensory thought is *always* a *direct operation* to increase that thought's contribution to our experience, that's a useful rule of thumb. The world contains all "thoughts" at all times - all creation is done already! - it's just a matter of which ones we have made "bright" relative to the others.

Also, we only need to bring a part of the larger idea into awareness to activate its larger pattern - but the more specific you are, the narrower the context and the more particular the change. So finishing off by pondering various formulations:

Good Examples:

- We sensorily imagine *now* an owl sitting in the space in front of us and really feel its presence. (Simple activation of the thought-pattern. Owl-related patterns become more prominent in experience generally, but in a global and non-specific way.)
- We sensorily imagine *now* an owl being in the zoo when we visit next Thursday. (Specific activation of an experience in time. That specific experience arises; other aspects of the owl pattern also appear more generally.)
- "I will see more owls" or "I always see owls". (The verbal command *implies* the generalised owl thought-pattern. As before.)
- "I will see an owl in the zoo on Thursday" or "Next Thursday's zoo trip contains owls". (The verbal command *implies* the specific experience. As before.)

Bad Examples:

- "I wish I would see more owls." (You have just re-created the experience of wishing.)
- "Why do I never see any owls?" (You have just re-asserted the fact that you never see any owls.)
- Repeatedly imagining an empty zoo and then visualising owls being delivered and being there. (Every time you do this, you reset the situation, and you're not specifically imagining your own desire being fulfilled.)

  It's okay to imagine "out there in the world" events because they imply subsequent observations, but it's a bit nonspecific and lots of other things might happen to deny your desire. In contrast, an imagining corresponding to "I will experience this" cuts straight to it - in effect directly inserting it into your apparent timeline.

So yeah, generally I reckon the idea that "whatever you imagine is *literally* asserting a fact in the world by implication" - and this is *always* true because what thinking actually is, is an act of "pulling bits of the world around and varying their contribution or fact-ness" - is quite a powerful view to take.

> ["I will see an owl in the zoo on Thursday" or "Next Thursday's zoo trip contains owls". (The verbal command implies the specific experience. As before.)]; that can all be *planned* with clear destinations viewable - websites, brochures, etc

For sure, it's just an example to keep things simple. A clearer version will be "I will meet Tim [who I haven't heard of in ten years] next week".

Reply to “Forbidden knowledge erased”

> [OP: Has anyone ever felt like they've had a thought that gives you a deep answer or key to life, only to forget it seconds later? I've had this happen a few times recently. It's like a thought will enter my head, or rather be "pushed" into my head, that leaves me in awe. Then, it just disappears from my head and I can't even remember what it was, or a trace of it, no matter how hard I try. All I'm left with is the feeling of awe, like I saw behind a veil to something incredible and someone whisked me away before I was able to fully see it. Anyone else?]

It could be that the "thought" is actually the experience of the gap between thoughts - the raw openness - and so you can't re-member it. You can't remember it, because it can't be conceived of, and it leaves no trace because it's a *lack of sensory content*.

> > So a taste of death?

Hard to say. Some stories here and elsewhere would suggest that experiencing of some sort continues after experiencing "dying". Perhaps it's better to say something like: it's a taste of *not-being-a-person*.

[...]

"How can mirrors be real if our eyes aren't real?" :-)

So - it's probably more accurate to say that there are *light-as-wave* observations and there are *light-as-particle* observations - but beyond this "light" doesn't exist in any particular state, other than as a concept in a fictional narrative, a story we use to connect the gaps between observations. Light doesn't "happen" except for the observing of it.

[[A: Aha! So if this goes for light, this should go for everything else too, right? Nothing happens except for the observing of it? So the observing, done by an observer, creates(?) (renders?) everything as it's being observed/experienced? So there is no world except for the observer and what he observes - and how do you separate the two? Is it even possible to separate the two?]]

Yes, it goes for everything! So there is no separation between the observer and the observed. We might think of "the observer" as being an open aware space in which his experiences arise - we could say that an observer *takes on the shape of* their observations.

This does leave us with a couple of questions though, which I'll have a stab at:

- **How is it that the world appears *to-have-happened* though?**

  It does seem like things have been going on while my attention was elsewhere, hwo can this be? This might be explained by "creation-by-implication". When we direct our attention in a particular direction, an experience is triggered which is plausible given the observations thus far.

- **If the world isn't *out there* then in what sense does it exist?**

  Maybe it exists only in the sense that all possible experiences are simultaneously available - like all the individual frames of all possible movies being stacked in the projector at once - and all that changes is the "brightness" of them, varying in their relative contributions to our current moment.

It only seems like there's a world happening "out there" because we've got into the habit of selecting our *next-moment* based on the contents of the *now-moment* plus our history. Except when we slip up and things seem to shift discontinuously and break the rules - a "glitch"!

[[A: I think you nailed it right on the head! I would even take it a bit 'further'.

"When we direct our attention in a particular direction, an experience is triggered which is plausible probable given the observations thus far."; My theory is that our experience of now is just a collapsed point of several probability lines. The past is a 'written' line, the now is the current focus, and the future is a string of probablity lines that are always in flux until you reach the next 'iteration of time' (aka. next delta-T) where it collapses and manifests as the most probable function. Each line of probability is continously moved towards or away from the collapse point (now) according to how previous collapse points have occured. In this model everything that can happen is possible, but everything that can happen has a different degree of probability of happening.]]

Yes, you can certainly describe it that way!

I've been trying not to use "probable" because (of course) we never actually experience probability - it's a tool, an abstraction, but some groups have taken to be objectively true lately. "Plausible" makes it sound more like what it is: a story we make up and make a judgement on. But "probability" is as good a metaphor as any!

Now the fun stuff. Given that all possible experiences are *available*, and it's our previous observations that define the contribution of possibilities (your "probabilities") towards future observations - is it possible to *influence* this? All possible observations are "here, now" - even unlikely ones. Is there a way to make an unlikely one take priority? How can we force a glitch or discontinuous change?

[[A: Well, learning from established physics and quantum mechanics, isn't it now a common understanding that whatever is observed becomes affected simply by being observed? So how to influence the possibilities could maybe be, at least first, to *observe* the possibilities in some way?

How to observe probabilities/possibilities when all you are is "aware space" or "consciousness"? **Imagination**!! Until we get a machine that is able to calculate and/or discern future possible probabilities, I think that is as close as we're gonna get to manipulate the outcomes.

But merely observing something and therefore changing/affecting it is one thing - if we assume it is possible to at least influence the possibilities in this way, can we assume it is possible to influence the possibilities in a controlled way? In a directed way? In a way that intends one possibility to become manifest instead of another? Or as you said, is there a way to make an unlikely possibility take priority over a more likely one?

Here we would need experimental testing, re-testing and triple-testing. Let's set up the premises we would need:

- 1: Probabilities can be affected by observation
- 2: Imagination is a form of observation
- 3: Probabilities can therefore be affected by imagination
- 4: Imagination can be controlled
- *Inference from previous premises*: **Probabilities can therefore be affected and controlled by imagination**

Then do rigorous testing to try to *disprove* any of these premises. First and most obvious flaw in this experimental setup is it would rely almost entirely on subjective reporting (but then again, as we've already covered, there can't be observation without observer - it's impossible to get around the subject). But maybe that wouldn't matter, because in any case we could set up *imagined* possibilities, then have a subject attempt to control the imagined possibilities into a certain desired 'state', then observe if the 'outside Universe' conformed to the controlled imagined possibility or not, or if it did so to any discernable degree.]]

An excellent summary and I completely agree. The only area I would pick at would be the idea of an "outside universe", since such a thing can never be experienced. Earlier we established that there is no observer-observed separation. This means that we don't *affect* things by observing them, we *bring them into fact* by doing so. This means that the world *is* our accumulated observations, and that includes the observations of (apparent) other people. So, we hit a problem. Although we have ignored the situation for 2000 years, we are forced to admit (to re-admit) that the world is subjective and we each have a "private copy" or view of it. And this means that the experience of "observing someone use imagination to influence the world" is *also* a part of the private copy. In other words, we cannot prove this to someone else, because **that proof is always really to ourselves and *within ourselves!***

[[A: Absolutely! And that's why I wrote 'outside Universe' with apostrophes ;P

Formulating it as "bringing them into fact" is as succinctly as it can be put, I think, because as words are limiting at best, this description says a lot about the apparent mechanics of this process. And yes, finally, it's impossible to prove anything, and even to ourselves that proof would be dubious. Our private copy of existence is like a self-referential loop, or a mirror placed in front of a mirror, creating an endless fractal of self-referential data. Oh, and even if we can't get out of our own private copy and therefore never know anything about any fictitious/non-existant 'outside' world, for practical purposes, the experiment could still be attempted in the subject-in-object reality view that today's science use, and would likely produce entertaining data no matter what the results were :) It would actually be interesting to test, if only on a very small scale!]]

Sorry, mere apostrophes just weren't sufficient there - it needed to have full quotation marks! ;-)

Because the looping/mirroring metaphor can get a bit tangled and implies two parts where there is really only one - I find it easier to describe in terms of the activating of already-existing patterns. This lets us dodge infinite regression and maintain the idea of an ongoing "now" - but different metaphors are good for different contexts anyway. As you indicate, we can't get out of our own private copy, because we aren't actually in it. Rather, the private copy is *within* us and it includes our bodies as part of the world! Even the latest interpretations of QM (such as QBism) are giving up on objective interconnected aspects, although they hand-wavingly say that maybe some sort of objective explanation might come in the future. (Nope!)

However, if for fun we at least allow there to be multiple "perspectives", then there's still value in doing the experiment. We can think of the world as being a *shared set of patterns* (rather than a *shared environment*). By contributing new connections or activations from our private copy, we are making those available to other copies - albeit indirectly - thus spreading the magic for everyone else! :-)

[[A: Hehe. Yep. And on that note we conclude this circle jerk ;)

PS. Even "within us" brings up a separation problem, but all words would eventually be insufficient to describe anything. They work like approximations, always beating around the bush, indicating or pointing to that which it is beating around :P]]

Well done us for solving reality! ;-)

PS. Yeah, true, there's really no way to say it because all words and metaphors imply separation into parts and then a relationship in space.

Catch you next time!

Reply to “What are all of your theories ?”

> [Q1: Honestly I haven't seen anything that explains the types of glitches people describe in this sub. I keep seeing references to quantum physics where these weird types of things are possible (such as particles "warping" from one spot to another), but if these glitches were a result of quantum effects, we would expect to see glitches different that what we see now. For example, why don't we see missing object re-appearing partially inside the wall or floor? Or why don't we just see small pieces of an object move in space or time? Even if we were in a simulation, it seem strange that the glitches seem to generally fall into a few different types, when a real simulation could have a wide variety of "glitches" that would produce glitches that would given it away the fact that we are in a simulation by now. And even the theories that could possibly explain some of what we see in this sub don't explain (or some cases would rule out the possibility of) the types of stories so many people are reporting on /r/Thetruthishere or /r/Paranormal]

Yes, the effects do seem to always be "chunked" into meaningful human concepts.

Objects move as a whole even though from a non-human perspective the perimeter of that particular object is nothing special (sets of keys, a lost diary, a whole person). More broadly speaking, complete "facts" are changed rather than partial or cross-border sections of reality; the world after the glitch remains a *coherent* one - it still makes sense within itself. That is how it is perceived anyway.

This is a hint, I think. Perhaps it is meanings and not objects that change, or perhaps "the underlying pattern" shifts and is perceived as shifts of particular meaningful objects when really they are just artefacts of something else.

[...]

[Q2: Or, it is all a dream. Once you realize it and 'wake up', achieving lucidity (within this dream), you can, to certain extent, manipulate it.]

How do you wake up? Then, how do you manipulate?

> > I have lucid dreams, but I have no idea HOW -

These days, I've concluded that it's simply a case of *deciding you are going to*. There is no technique to it; it's just a matter of committed intention and confidence. Trying to do it actually gets in the way.

(I have no idea how I move my arms either. I just decide. Same thing?)

> > So, maybe the same techniques could be used ..?

It's an interesting line of thought! And I think you're right about its connection to enlightenment.

Enlightenment, in my thinking, is maybe a release of a hold on the narrow focus of attention. You then become: a) Aware that you are not your everyday patterns, but a larger space that they appear in and: b) Those patterns now become more flexible, because you are not holding onto them tightly with that focus.

But then it's a matter of just how flexible things are. Are we living in sort-of-overlapping individual dreams where we have quite a lot of power, or is it more of a shared dream where the consensus expectations of all the "people" lock things down pretty tight?

So no technique, just intention (flapping my arms is just a matter of deciding to) but possibilities are limited by the influence of other people (flapping my arms doesn't make me fly).

[...]

> [Q3: You manipulate because you are not really here. Our bodies are like avatars and we live in the 3D envirnoment called our universe. You wake when you die.]

Or the other way around: We are experiential spaces in which the world appears. The world fades, **we don't**.

> > But these bodies are no more real than the world.

Right. Our bodies are *part of the environment*. Our experiences appear within us. If we think of ourselves as an "open aware space" and the body, mind and world as simply sensations, thoughts and perceptions arising in that space, we are nearer the mark.

> > A movie I found interesting, Idenity, was made on the concept the past is created as we require the details.

I haven't seen it, but that sounds interesting. Having some fun with this:

Alan Watts had a nice analogy about the present moment. He used the metaphor of "the ship and its wake". Imagine a ship in the ocean, behind it is the wake it leaves. You would never say that the wake *causes* the ship; rather then ship *causes* the wake according to its position/movements. In the same way, the present moment *causes* the past. Alternatively, we might go with the idea of "narrative coherence". It is inherent in the structure of the present moment that a past recalled would be consistent with it. It is *implicit in the pattern you are experiencing*. Not cause-effect, just part of the same thing. If you could directly change the present *overall*, then that would involve a corresponding "past". (Which, after all, is just a *felt-knowing* in the present until it is unpacked.)

When you open a door in a dream, there's always a landscape beyond. Go look for a justification for something, and you'll always find one. Try to come up with a story ("a past") about how you got here, you'll get one. *Because that's what you have asked for, via a creative problem-solving intention.*

[...]

> [Q: I'm pretty sure it's a simulation from a couple of my glitches, but multiple dimensions makes sense in its own way. Possibly a simulation on the same network as similar simulations (or simulations that are set up the same but things that are random went different ways). I don't think it being a simulation makes it any less real, though, if that makes any sense. We're clearly sentient and interacting with an environment, so it doesn't really matter whether we're bits of data or players who will wake up to some realer reality.]

Right. It doesn't actually make much difference what experience is "made from" because we never really have access to it, we just have access to the experience made from it.

Even going along with the standard worldview: No-one ever experiences "matter". They experience particular *things* with particular *properties*.

So call it "matter" or "information" or "simulation-stuff" or "reality-stuff". The core thing of being *aware* and being *aware-of* patterns of content, that is what is important.

Which might lead you to suggest that the only property that is fundamental is this *being-aware*, and everything is patterns of that. This means that the rules of the world are up for grabs, potentially - they are long-term habits rather than eternal baked-in laws:

*"**Nothing is forbidden**, it's only less often."*

[...]

> Q: I think it's probably that we create our reality. What we believe to happen or will happen does...until an opposing view comes into play. I don't know about your glitch, but if there was anyone else who believed something different in the area, it could e reality was fitting their view. I think overall reality is a consensus view whatever the majority of us believe to be is, if you're the only opposition in that view, then your reality will glitch to align with the majority consensus. That's what I believe.

I like that idea overall, but how are clashes handled that involve time and history effects? (e.g. People are "reset" to before an event happens and previous facts about the world are now different.)

Is this a case of being "snapped to" an alternative consensus (thought of as so-called dimensional jumping) which exists simultaneously? Does this mean we are effectively all living in our own dreams, but with some overlap and sharing - to a greater or lesser extent.

> Q: Yes...the best way to describe it, is how heaven is described in What Dreams May Come. I think the Mandela effect is really a good description of what happens when some clashes occur...his death in prison being remembered by mostly probably people who weren't effected by his death or realize the impact on international relations so we tend to remember he died where those who were effected deeply changed the event but also have no recollection of the event or if they didn't at all hear about the death...so now a larger portion believes/views his death at a later time (recently) but a percentage of us are left with residual memory of him being dead in the 80's. You might think that it would just be erased from our conscious memory (certainly that would be less alarming) but it isn't always the case, yet since we can easily brush it off as a failure in our memories or a false memory, than it poses no threat to general consensus of Mandela living into old age.

I'm inclined towards a variation of this.

But - here's the key - what happened from Mandela's own perspective, do we suppose?

And: Could I deliberately choose, now, to have him "have died" in the 1980s "again"? And then: Can we basically discount others in the selection of our own dream content, because everyone is always okay from their own perspective? Or is there a moral element where our intentions really do inflict outcomes on others?

> Q: I think from the person who has died perception they still exist. I don't think you could still go to a perception of where Mandela died in the 80's now because the collective consensus is pretty cohesive in him dying at old age. Not to say it couldn't happen 100% but that the probability would be very low plus it would cause great incoherence in the linear time view, much moreso than the original incoherence we'd have 2 conflicting memories which would really mess up reality' s perception. I don't know how to explain it more basic. Like our perception would be majorly turned upside down. It is true the past present and future are not as linear as we perceive...but anything causing major incoherence in our linear view would cause reality to break down I think, so I don't

> know if it would be likely to happen and if it did, possibly our memories would just match the new reality so that we'd never know anyway, therefore keeping us believing we only perceived the event one way, so we wouldn't have a break in coherent reality. If that makes sense. Edit for misspelling

I follow what you mean I think. It's going to come down to - our personal dreams probably do vary in their coherence/overlap with other people's dreams. There's probably a bit of tension in terms of different apparent histories, but so long as it doesn't get too extreme it's okay. If things get *really* stretched though, then there might end up with multiple "consensus bubbles". Each consensus bubble (or "square in the grid of all possibilities") has a certain level of tolerance before a person *snaps-to* an adjacent consensus.

From Mandela's perspective, he never died in prison. For the duration of the time other people thought he did, he basically wasn't in their dreams anymore. I have an idea I quite like, which is that we are sort of "extended persons" but we only look through one "viewport" at any one moment.

For instance, it can be *simultaneously true* that "I" am hiking in the Himalayas with a friend, while doing the weekly shop with my girlfriend at a grocery store in Manhattan, while setting up an art gallery in London with my business partner, while being dead having been involved in a horrific car crash years ago, while sat at this computer with a beer typing at my desk. It just so happens that I am looking through the *sat-at-this-computer-typing* viewport right now, with a corresponding memory set.

Reply to “Serious question: Why do the stupidest most mundane posts get upvoted on this sub but actual glitches such as DeJavu or Double Slit experiments get downvoted?”

A couple of thoughts:

- Deja Vu reports which say "hey I thought I'd seen it before" without more detail, aren't glitches.
- Double slit experiments aren't glitches, and they're not typically personally experienced.
- What's mundane to you, isn't necessarily mundane to someone who had the "personal, everyday-mode experience for which you have no explanation."

I agree we don't know about deja vu - most of the theories are handwaving and unpersuasive (brain memory echoes and so on). I think many of the deja vu reports tend to get down voted because they don't contain any new information - and there are a lot of them. (Most of the reports *are* "I had this feeling I'd seen it before". This is different from any *explanation*, note.)

Do tell me what I don't understand about quantum physics and the double slit experiment! ;-) Tell me in what way it counts as a glitch, briefly.

Of *course* glitch reports are anecdotal - that's the point, surely, by the very definition? They are *personal* events which led the experiencer to doubt their ideas about how reality works. What the *nature* of that experience is, that's the next step.

EDIT: I'm an ex-physicist. For sure, quantum physics and the slits experiment certainly reveals a lot about our assumptions regarding our own abstractions, and the delayed choice experiment reveals even more about this - that our assumption that things "happen" between observations in the same form as we experience them is basically incorrect. It's thought-provoking for sure. And I think QBism is quite a nice attempt at producing a "single-user theory" that avoids all those crap many-worlds type interpretations.

But, there's no way to *scientifically* study the meaning behind the maths of quantum physics - and it *is* a mathematical theory. It's only ever going to be philosophy or metaphysics. So as regards glitches... the double slits is merely a fact, which reveals that we don't have a coherent narrative for those situations. It's on the list of "things to make better explanations for"... and there's not much new to say about it. It doesn't really provide any help for glitch experiences, other than emphasising the old philosophical problem, that we cannot tell what the form of the world is beyond the formatting of our sensory experience - assuming there *is* a beyond - and it remains an "infinite gloop" which cannot be interrogated.

So, there is a problem with the simulation/program metaphor. I suggest that it takes an old philosophical idea, and then sprinkles inappropriate computer metaphors on top.

Let's play with this...

The philosophical idea is that *the universe is not of the same form as our experiences*. Specifically, that space and the passage of time are *part of experiences*, the formatting of our senses, rather than the formatting of the universe itself. The universe itself, in fact, just cannot be described, because it is "before" division and "before"

change. We might refer to it as an "infinite gloop". What we actually experience, then, is *the patterning of our own minds*. And what are minds made of? *Consciousness*.

The universe is therefore a particular distribution of patterns (or "facts") at different levels of contribution; a landscape across which our attentional focus apparently shifts. There is no *substrate* to this patterning, no underlying solidity. There is no "hardware" to this "software". Furthermore, the landscape is static, so there is no sense in which the "software" is "run"; there is no processing. Or rather, the only processing is consciousness taking on the shape of different patterns, which happens "before" the experience of time.

So, that's like a blend of George Berkeley, Immanuel Kant, non-dualism, and some other stuff: philosophical idealism.

What about quantum mechanics then?

Well, what experiments with quantum mechanics reveal to us, is that we hit a limit as to what can be conceptualised. We are stuck, in thought, with imagining in terms of "parts" and their relationship in space, unfolding in time. However, the world is *not* a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time", it is a superposition of patterns basically "dissolved" into subjective consciousness. This doesn't matter usually, and we imagine that when we're not looking, the world is still "happening" behind the scenes - but that is not the case. In fact:

- The only thing that ever "happens", is observations.
- All descriptions we create to explain observations are *connective fictions* and never actually happen.
- At small scales we are forced to confront the statically patterned nature of the world.

Speaking very broadly here, just to get the general point across. But you maybe get the idea.

And glitches? Glitches correspond to a shift of the "world-pattern" of a particular conscious perspective, where the "world-pattern" is defined as the particular distribution of patterns contributing to the ongoing experience; the static landscape that corresponds to the current state of the world within a subjective conscious viewpoint. Which is why I'd separate out QM and glitches:

- The double slit observation is an artefact of the "granularity" of a space and time based landscape or "world-pattern".
- A glitch is a *shift* in that world-pattern which leaves only a memory within the subjective consciousness, with no observable trace in the world-pattern itself.

TL;DR: Stuff about philosophy, consciousness, patterns, granularity and shifts!

Responses & Reasons

> How can a glitch be a shift in patterns when the pattern is intended to shift and there are trillions of simulations and options that you are not aware of?

That's called "begging the question", I'd say! :-)

Have you ever had an experience other than your own? Have you ever seen "other simulations"? You have only ever experienced the content of your own subjective viewpoint. To understand the nature of experiencing, and from there understand the content of experience, you need to refocus on the subjective, in my view.

> And the very fabric of this Universe, the canvas and the rules that govern it is in fact the Matrix.

You don't need that extra metaphorical layer for your explanation, though. In fact, it makes "the Matrix" kind of meaningless - it's equivalent to saying "stuff is made from stuff" and still leaves the area of consciousness unanswerable.

> But it exists, how else do you think you are able to walk in the 3rd dimension . . . it is because of the rules.

This flips things around incorrectly, I think. In fact it flips science around badly too. "The rules" don't *cause* anything, just as "the laws of physics" don't cause anything. What you are talking about is "regularities in experience", from which you might *make up* a connective fiction about "rules" - but there's no need to. If experience is inherently patterned, then the natural state is not chaos, the natural state is *the formation of habits*. I've seen those videos before. They amount to seeing patterns in experience. It's a nice demonstration, but it's not the demonstration of what he thinks it is. The universe is *not* a computer system. Our experiences are *patterned* certainly, and that pattern *is you*, I suggest. Which is in effect what Quantum Bayesianism takes as an approach.

QBism & The Now

Here's the more accessible article on QBism (the first one), plus an article that may or may not be useful to you about reification of abstractions by the same author:

- *Physics: QBism puts the scientist back into science*, N David Mermin
- *What's bad about this habit*, N David Mermin

It's quite a good read, the QBism one, especially on the subject of *The Now*, although you'll notice he chickens out at one point. Specifically here

> "When you and I are communicating face-to-face I cannot imagine that a live encounter for me could be only a memory for you, or vice versa."

I *can* imagine this, and in fact it's the only reasonable account of how subjective perspectives interact: they don't, as such.

Consolidation & Content

Cutting to it, why am I being so dismissive of the "simulation hypothesis"? Because it's yet another metaphorical abstraction. It's completely fine as that, but it should not be confused with "how things really are", which is much simpler: patterns in the mind. Simulations, objective universes, the material world, all those things are inventions to try and counter the fact that there is no outside to experience, and all potential experiences are dissolved within it, essentially. For example, the room next door is not "over there". These all old ideas, of course, with Zen buddhism, philosophical idealism, having covered the same ground repeatedly. The metaphor I find useful is this one:

- *The Imagination Room*

It's a neat way of realising that you are an "open aware conscious space" which takes on the shape of experiences, including the experience of having a 3D viewpoint, of *being-a-person-in-a-world*. It is the patterning of that experiencing space, rather than an inherent structure in an extended externally-defined universe, that is responsible for the regularities you see around you.

Basically: **you are living *as* your own theory at all times**. Why do you think all these different theories are promoted by people with such dedication? Why are they so convinced they are right? It's worth pondering. For you, that theory is "we're in a simulation". For me, it's "I am an open space of awareness". For some people, it's "god is talking to me personally and I'm being chased by government spies". The fun thing is, you can very quickly change your patterning so that another theory seems to be true. By this time next month, I could have you convinced that owls are running the universe! ;-)

Aside - Actually, you might find Kirby Suprise's book on *Synchronicity* interesting on this front. I don't totally agree with his model (but he is upfront in saying it's just a descriptive fiction, so that's okay), but as a clinical psychologist who has experimented with people's tendency to literally experience their own theories as true, it's worth a read.

Thanks for the interesting conversation, by the way - TG

Reply to “Telepathy is normal”

> [OP: I originally posted this as a reply to a comment on this sub, but I figured that you may find it interesting, so I'm posting it again here. I have been having extremely "telepathic" experiences lately like this one. Just tonight (this is happening almost every day now) I am laying in bed with my girlfriend. A thought pops in to my head, "I'm going to go". It's my bed, my house, I have nowhere to go. I instantly replied "No." back to the thought, because I didn't want my girlfriend to leave lol. I asked her directly after that, "did you just have a thought of "I'm going to go"? She said yes... and told me to stop putting thoughts in her head (jokingly)... this happens a lot. She told me right after that she didn't really want to leave yet, and didn't know exactly why she had that thought. Maybe I put the thought in her head? Maybe I "heard" her thought? it is really hard to tell where the thought originated, but the fact is that we both had the same thought, at the same time.
>
> Have you ever been in a conversation, and found that your thoughts were actually steering the direction of the conversation, even if you hadn't said anything? Lately I have been feeling that we all "read minds." I mean, whales communicate telepathically*, why couldn't humans evolve similarly? I have a pretty good idea that we have... most of us just haven't quieted our minds enough to hear past our own chatter. We mistake the psychic signals that are constantly sending off other people as our own thoughts. Where do the thoughts originate?
>
> This is all just a working hypothesis. I don't know exactly what to make of it all quite yet, but it's some pretty trippy stuff for me. It feels very... normal, though. Privacy may not even exist in my own cranium.
>
> I also wanted to ask; do you ever disagree with "your thoughts"? Does anything ever pop in to your head that you just flat out do not agree with? Are you alone when this happens?
>
> *edit: poor wording choice. I was mainly referring to the low frequency sounds that they can send for hundreds of miles to each other. Which isn't exactly telepathy. I may have over-stated the "telepathy" part quite a bit.]

So I guess saying that *any* thoughts are "your thoughts" is problematic, perhaps.

Rambles and strained metaphors to follow...

Just because a thought appears in your spoken voice, doesn't mean it is "yours"- that it represents your considered view on something or it is "what you think"- any more than a muscle twitch in your leg is. Passing thoughts can then be viewed as merely part of the current state of your subjective world, just like any other sense or body sensation is.

When you see your girlfriend lying next to you, that visual image is an experience arising in your mind, but you wouldn't normally say that it is "your" image of your girlfriend. The thought "I'm going to go" is arising in *the exact same space* as that image, and yet we tend to label it as "my" thought. Really, it might be more accurate to label such a passing thought as *the world's* thought. This leaves us with only *intentional* thought as being "ours". But following on from the above, perhaps that is really wrong too. The *intentional act* is ours but the resulting *thought* is not; intentional thoughts are best described as "the intentional creation of a *world thought*" perhaps.

It's like we are all sculptors making modifications to a shared "shape". We confuse some parts of the shape with "ourselves" but actually that part is being modified by everyone else too. Telepathy is when we stop hacking at it with our own chisel (so to speak), notice the more subtle changes that are happening anyway, and realise it's not just "our" part after all.

> [Q: I agree. So if this is common knowledge... why is it not common knowledge? Do these experiences imply something more than physical existence? Are thoughts possibly metaphysical? Also, why am I being down voted?]

Actually, these experiences imply something *less*. They imply that both "physical experience" and "thought" are sensations arising in the mind, and that the only difference is in their persistence and intensity.

The physical world becomes just a particularly bright, stable, 3D-immersive *strand of thought* which arises from a single "world-pattern" that underlies all your experiences (think: the sun obscuring the stars in the daylight sky). It's not common knowledge because this destroys the notion of an "external" world, and leads to philosophical idealism and eventually non-dualism. It's not easy to grasp conceptually - it changes how you must conceive of "you" - and it's contrary to the dominant narrative that we've been using successfully for the last 50-100 years (although the debate is turning).

The voting is always a bit flaky here initially!

> [Q: I see. I like where you're going with this by bringing non-dualism in to play right off that bat. Fortunately, that is how I conceive of "me" and "you". It is not an easy concept to grasp, except for when it is. Then it is the easiest thing, because it was here all along. It isn't like these concepts are new. They've been around for thousands of years. They're easily accessible to anyone that seeks truth within themselves. Meditation, dreams, psychedelics and you and I have a lot in common. I know I am not really saying anything at all, but the way you've just reiterated the conclusions I have been coming to was brilliant. I like you. Do you feel that there was an effort to push away from the reality of non-dualism? Is there an effort to keep this suppressed? It seems as though half of the world has known the truth all along, and the other half is slowly waking up. But why? How did we forget in the first place? Do you understand what I am trying to say? It is 5am and I haven't slept so maybe I am not articulating as well as I mean to. Would we have ever ventured into the technological discoveries that we have today if we hadn't "forgotten"? Would they even matter if we were always aware of the duality of life? I am trying to distinguish whether it was a negative effort to suppress the true nature of reality, or if it was just a natural course that we took, or if I am just completely delusional of reality. I just want to know why...]

There is no conspiracy or effort, other than the effort of people to pursue what they perceive as beneficial to them, and shape the world accordingly. These things naturally fluctuate, ebb and flow. People adopt the narrative that best supports their ambitions, not necessarily the one that is true; ambitions change over time.

Of course, this is complicated by the fact that the worldview you adopt becomes the "formatting" of your mind, leading to experiences which support your view, in a pattern-triggering feedback loop. *This applies to your thinking about this topic also.*

The "strong materialism" of the last half-century was really not about "material" so much as the underlying belief by many that our explanatory fictions were "true" - an unfortunate reification of successful abstractions.

Prior to this the likes of Neils Bohr suggested that (say) quantum mechanics revealed the subjective nature of observation - harking back to the Greeks before the arbitrary objective/subjective division was introduced for ease of theorising - and recent approaches such as QBism are a return to that.

[...]

> [Q: It's better if people realize this all on their own or with trusted people who care about them than over the internet. That's why it's a faux pas to talk about this, why you're being downvoted.]

I think that many people who have experiences that they can't explain are not fortunate enough to have the time or resources to "realize this on their own", or have trusted people who can help. Surely the great thing about the internet is that it can make others' experiences and worldviews available to them, even when those are niche and unusual, whereas before those people would probably... die in ignorance.

> [Q: True, but the realization that thoughts may not always be private can be shocking to many people. If you just tell someone online "my girlfriend heard what I was thinking the other day" they might just use it as a conformation bias that everyone will hear their thoughts all the time. Imagine completely believing that reality, how angry and scared would you get? What might an already depressed person do if they thought all their secrets and shames were out in the open? Anyone can read what you write on the internet and take any message from it. This sort of conversation has to be handeled with care and done between people who aren't freaked out and have a mutual understanding of what's going on. Free speech is important but there's a reason no one talks openly about this stuff with strangers. It's a faux pas on par with discussing your bedroom routine in the 19th century. I'm not saying this will never be a public issue and should never be tapped, but before we start speculating on our personal experiences we should let society be educated in a responsable way. We shouldn't be looking out for the people who don't know, we should be looking out for the people who kinda know and are a little freaked out about the issue.]

Let's face it, most people read such things and dismiss them as a bit of nonsense, while also having a mild intuition that occasionally things happen. They think no more of it! But if they are *already* thinking about it, then surely it's better that they can come across some discussion before the synchronicity effect gets a hold of them. Society isn't ever going to be educated in a responsible way about this sort of thing, unless it's by people like the participants on this forum.

> [Q: It has become impossible for me to dismiss it as a bit of nonsense. I would just be lying to myself. The synchronicity is stronger than ever in my life. But it's had an undesired effect on me. I am still slightly depressed and I mostly have no energy to even leave the house. I feel so alive when I am out of the house and on my own, but when I come back home (to my parent's house), I just feel so... down. I thought it was just social anxiety for a while. As a thinker that's highly intuitive, I figured my mind was just creating a complex situation to prevent me from interacting with people. That this was my mind's interpretation of my social anxiety. I haven't completely rejected this theory, but it just doesn't feel right. Again, I feel as if I would be lying to myself if I accepted that as truth.]

Some related thoughts, perhaps they might be useful -

Something to maybe notice: when you are out and about vs at home, how expanded or contracted is your attention? If you were to think of your ongoing experience as a vast imagination room, would your attention be localised around your body or head, or would it be open and full and at the outer reaches?

Expanding your sense of "presence" to fill the entire space of your body, and then the room, and then beyond is a great way to feel alive and open and better (I have found).

And although it may be somewhat daunting at first, it can be enormously helpful to expand this "space" out when you are interacting with other people. It's counter-intuitive (surely you'd want to protect yourself by withdrawing from them?) but including other people, the whole room even, in your "presence" dissolves them *within you*, makes them part of you and under your experiential control. It means they are not "other" and not a threat, and you pick up full information from them.

I feel a large component of social anxiety eventually arises from the issue of being disconnected from your surroundings. Other people, without realising it, *literally* "share space" when they interact, and automatically feel each other out in a sort of "direct knowing" (this is the true nature of empathy). To the person who has accidentally withdrawn from that, situations involving other people become confusing - because they have one of their sense turned off.

An additional trick, related to this, is to centre your attention lightly in your lower abdomen area when you are interacting with other people (and even just living life generally actually). This location is where the *felt-sense* resides, that "global summary" of a situation. This is where people "connect". It also tends to spontaneously open out your attention, make you feel more "spacious" and "here", for free.

> I had been analyzing people rather than allowing myself to share the same space as them.

Right. It's the difference between *direct-knowing* and *thinking-about*. You know something by literally touching it, rather than conceptualising it. Trying to work things out *sans overlap* leaves you situationally blind, but unaware of your predicament. If you reach out and touch the surface of a table, you *know* it is textured and hard; you don't think about "hardness". You include it in your awareness and witness a direct truth. Really, you interact with something by *becoming* it - and that understanding leads to interesting places.

You really don't need to think at all, except to choose what "formatting" you want to have overlaying your experience. When you think intentionally, you are literally tugging at the fabric of your "world-pattern". Note that passing thoughts are fine; they are just fragments of your world state briefly revealing a sensory aspect.

"Jumping" - For that stuff, I'd recommend you start simply. You might begin by summoning *The Owls Of Eternity* and then you might do the *Two Glasses Exercise* for a situation in your local sphere. Just like the other stuff we're talking about, you only understand it by having the experience, so the first port of call is to give yourself an experience.

> I notice my most intelligent moments are ... but rather responding naturally to the given experience I find myself in.

An experience already implies a response, a problem already implies its solution - because *this-moment* already implies its *next-moment*. That's why it's good to keep intentions broad rather than niggling at details, I'd say.

You'll notice that I say in the exercise description something like "knowing that it is now done, carry on with your life". This refers to not constantly playing with the world-pattern. It's what is meant by an attitude of *non-attachment* (being okay with whatever happens), and notions of "faith" and all that stuff.

If you are sitting down and want to shift to a standing state, keeping thinking about "being sat down" would reassert the sitting state and prevent it shifting into standing. You can probably see the relevance...

I'd leave the hair thing for now, but you can certainly come back to it, once you have a feel of things and how it applies to you. For your initial experiments, it's better to choose something that isn't constantly within your attention, since until you are convinced, you will find it harder to trust.

The overall approach is: you do the experiments, draw your own conclusions, **your results are the authority**.

Reply to “[META] Help! Looking for a way out! To REDO life.”

Getting straight to it: if suicide is indeed a reliable way to jump realities, then it is the most *undirected* way there is. The "new life" you might so quickly start may well take on the unfortunate aspects of this life, but magnified. It would be a complete spin of the roulette wheel. It is better to *in some way*, whether by everyday or esoteric means, tackle it from this position first. Either way you will have to put something into it. If you want to make a massive change, it's not likely that simply doing mirror+candle will do it. The mirror and the candle are not themselves causal. Have you truly given up yet? As in, become exhausted and surrendered absolutely? For as long as you are still fighting the current world-state, you will be unable to have your experience shift even by mundane action, because you will in effect be preventing all movement. (EDIT: In other words, you need to let go in order to have change.)

In fact, if one were to believe in the "quantum immortality" worldview as presented, your suicide likely wouldn't work at all, so attached are you to your present state. (For some reason the movie *The Quiet Earth* springs to mind!)

[...]

Just to clarify first: I don't think anyone is advocating suicide in the comments here? They are taking different approaches to saying "suicide is not the solution". Some are outright stating that it's a stupid idea and to just get on with living. Others start from OP's hypothesis that suicide is a way to switch reality and point out that even if this were so, the results wouldn't be good. All the views offered seem to be different ways of looking at it, which may or may not click depending on worldview.

> > It makes no sense to hold belief without evidence, your actions should always represent what is objectively true in the reality you experience.

Well that's the trick, isn't it? You never get access to an objective reality, just a subjective reality that other people seem to agree with certain elements of, via language. Evidence tends to accumulate for your worldview regardless of what is. Often the thing that exactly doesn't help is a "declaration of reality", because it is in direct conflict with their actual experience. That's where this comes in...

> > I can't believe you people are dignifying this line of reasoning with any amount of sincerity. . . you're reinforcing his mindset instead of calling it out as the complete drivel it is.

If you're not going to dignify someone's line of reasoning as your starting point, how do you expect to communicate with someone and help them out of a situation? You have to talk on other people's terms, and then extend that reasoning beyond its boundaries. You make some good points about the present and the past, but present them as a rant which would turn off any reader. It comes over as an overly emotional asserting of your own worldview, rather than actually entering into a conversation with OP.

> > The negative aspects of your past are entirely created and perpetuated by you and you alone.

This is not true and is very unhelpful in its assigning of responsibility. I'm sure OP has been told something of this sort many times, and I'll bet it did absolutely no good at all - because it doesn't offer any scope for change.

Right now, the past doesn't exist in the sense of being a location. That is true. However, it *does* exist as a contributing pattern to perception and behaviour, in the same way that rain-water flowing on a landscape causes erosion which influences the flow of subsequent rain-water.

We can tell someone that past rainfall is "for all intents and purposes fictitious" but that doesn't stop its effect having an ongoing influence on the present flow of experience. *Your perception of today is literally shaped by the ongoing presence of the past*, in ways that are not always easily grasped. It's often not that you dwell on the past - it's the past that dwells on you!

> The only thing it takes is realizing the past is the past and now is now.

Do you really think this? I suspect you have never been in a situation where suicide has been a serious option, then.

Nothing you say will be news to OP, otherwise he wouldn't have be having a problem in the first place. Your approach is ignorant and disrespectful and probably causes more harm than good. OP obviously posted here for a reason...

Reply to “[META]Let's pull the alternate dimensions and aliens and demons away for a sec- Your brain lies and takes shortcuts.”

One potential issue here is, you are invoking "the brain" like it is some sort of all-purpose explanation black box, without being able to go into *how, exactly* it accounts for the experiences. (Not your fault: nobody can.)

The Baader-Meinhof explanation, for example, is remarkably hand-waving as a "theory", as indeed are most descriptions invoking fallibility of attention and memory - because we lack actual models for those things (memory is particularly problematic, in terms of form and location; we don't know the nature of memory at all). These descriptions tend to be not much more than reformulations of the basic observation - they are often *namings and categorisations*, rather than actual *explanations*. Which is not to say that, um, "parallel universes" or whatever is the preferred explanation either. It's more about recognising the crap nature of some of the default generalisations we might invoke, *as well as* the crap nature of the more esoteric ones. Critical thinking, deep unpacking, applies to *all* potential explanations.

We really have to take reports on a case by case basis, I think, because these categorisations often don't really respond to the details of the report, and are more like an "explaining away". (Of course I'm talking about the more in-depth posts here.) This is really a specifics-based topic. "it's just your memory" or "you were a child" or "frequency illusion" all rather depends on the exact context. It's also important to recognise when we simply do not have sufficient information to properly account for the experience. Which, here, is almost always. Mostly, the correct response is an open verdict.

But that's okay, because - Surely the *real* underlying purpose of the subreddit isn't to "explain away" every post, but instead to use them as an opportunity to explore our hidden assumptions - the "facts" of the world that we take for granted which are not, when examined, particularly "factual" at all. They are more like automatic responses. Some of these assumptions are very fundamental - for example, even the idea that "the world" is a "stable, simply-shared, spatially-extended place unfolding in time". If one examines one's *actual, direct experience*, we might discover that we don't truly experience the world that way at all. That "world" is an *idea* that we *think about* now and again, but it might not be what we actually experience when we attend to our ongoing sensory experience. "The world" is, basically, a concept, and its familiar properties *might* just be habits of thinking...

Perhaps.

These things are fun to think about, anyway. And that's why this subreddit continues: because unpacking these ideas creatively in response to unusual experiences is *fun and interesting*. It's not necessarily about "being right" or "winning" an exchange by pushing a particular worldview as "how things really are".

Aside: I think there is an increasing tendency for people who are *enthusiasts* for certain subjects, but who have not read particularly deeply into them, to use that limited view as the basis for dismissal *or* promotion of a particular line of thinking. If you actually read the studies some accounts of "____ phenomenon" are based on, they are often pretty limited in scope and applicability. Meanwhile, if you are a popular science reader, your notion of the true weight of a particular theory might be incorrect - as in, the philosophical aspects, the "meta" stuff, may be lost on you, when it is this which often determines what it actually can be said to "explain" in the big picture view. Again, this all works both ways.

Reply to “[META] What is the logic behind reality?”

The word "real" causes a lot of problems for this stuff, I guess. Most people interpret "real" as meaning "out there independent of me", even though they never experience such a thing. What they actually mean is that the experience corresponds to a particular narrative, fits with a particular conceptual framework (specifically: the "container concept" that is "the objective world").

So concentrating on just the experience for the moment: neither Dad is false in and of themselves, the "falseness" is just a thought of "falseness" we have as subsequent "sensory frames" of experience render the "real Dad" narrative unworkable. Similar, perhaps, to the way "a dream" is really a "having woken up". Until you woke up, you weren't actually dreaming - because "dreaming" as an explanation *is* the choosing of the "I was dreaming" narrative; it is not part of the experience.

Really, we have to make a distinction between "ongoing sensory content" and *thoughts 'about'* that content. They are both strands of experience, though; they are both content within awareness. We could view them as being two streams of thought - it's just that one of them is a "bright 3D-immersive" thought ("reality" or "the world") and the other is a weaker diminished thought ("thoughts 'about' the world").

The mistake we often make is to confuse the latter as being identical with the former. However, there is no mechanism-based causal relationship between the two, and there's no reason to assume that the "given" strand is patterned in the same way as the "constructed" strand. Just as there is no reason to assume that the *world-as-it-is* is formatted in the same way as our human perception - that is, the world is not necessarily a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time", which is the assumption most of our narratives are based upon.

So I suppose the crux of this is the idea of "aboutness", and how this can lead to confusion when it comes to the relationship between different aspects of experience.

Reply to “[Meta] People dying and resetting, not exactly quantum immortality but a notable trend. Lets define this.”

I do like the phrase "Observer Permanence" (or "Persistence"). I guess we always need to be careful about defining the "observer" in these sorts of descriptive schemes. It is not a physical body that gets reset and continues, obviously. It's more that a "conscious perspective" always persists and that there is always a "next moment" of *experience*. Usually that "next moment" is pretty close to the previous moment, but when there is no logical next moment available (e.g. because the *assumed* observer, the body, is not going to be around) then things get a little discontinuous.

It's as if you are traversing a vast grid of all possible experiences by scanning your attention across it. You keep going along a trajectory across the grid until you hit a point where it doesn't make sense, then there's a shift. Perhaps you "don't die after all". Perhaps you *do* have an "experience of dying" and either end up experiencing some other land, *or* you start experiencing "someone else's body", maybe struggling to hold onto the previous memory when you do so.[1]

No matter what, experiences keep arising within this "conscious perspective" or "experiencing aware space" that you really are. Basically, there is always *more dream*.[2][3]

Notes

[1] So many everyday glitches involve an "urge to forget" or a difficulty in remembering. This may simply because it is hard to reach memories that don't "make sense" relative to the present experience. There is a very tenuous path between the two "patterns" of experience. If you had a fully discontinuous event, you would not have access to any residual glow from your previous state at all - when you did try to recall, you'd simply find confusion, or "memories" appearing consistent with your current state, created by the implication of you looking for them.

[2] Since the dream continues forever (more accurately: there just is no time), then at some point you are going to realise the state of things: that you are a "perceptual dream space" and dream content is appearing spontaneously within you. You might eventually realise that this means you can direct the dream. Eventually though, this might get boring - the emptiness of illusory challenges and danger - and you would actively *choose* to forget your true nature, and re-identify as a limited dream character.

[3] This also highlights that the world you apparently live in does not follow a "simple-sharing model". It is more like exploring an evolving pattern than living in a stable world with people and as a person.

[...]

Consciousness & Persistence

> I actually would be quite comfortable calling it Experiential Persistence.

Yes. Hmm. Although I suppose it's the *fact* of experience that persists, even if it is a "blank" experience for a while. The thing that truly persists is "that which experiences".

The reason I am being explicitly cautious about descriptions of the observer is that, upon examination, it's fairly easy to realise you aren't a located observer in a situation, and what you "are" can't really be described in terms of content. We have to be careful to distinguish between the uses of the word "consciousness":

- *Consciousness-of* - The content you are aware of. This is includes perceptions, sensations, thoughts.
- *Self-consciousness* - The identification of one part of that content as "you".
- *Consciousness* - The "stuff" from which experience is made *and* that-which-experiences. Upon investigation, this turns out to be all there is and what you-the-experiencer *really* are - "taking on the shape of experiences".

This isn't necessary for a vague idea of Experiential Persistence, but for making sense of the details it's required I think. Of vital importance is that we think of this *from a 1st-person subjective perspective*. The reason is that there *is* no 3rd-person objective view of this that can ever be experienced. We need to be more careful than usual to distinguish between reality (actual experience) and imaginary (thoughts *about* experience) here.

The phenomenon is inherently "before time and space". Time and space are aspects of the observer experience. They are "in" the observer; the observer is not "in" time and space. (You can actually notice this directly, however you can't *think-about* it, because thinking about it immediately *implies* time and space, since we think with "shadow senses".)

In our descriptions we must be careful not to just imagine a "universe out there" that is a continuation of the form of our 3d-sensory experience, seen by no-one.

Urge To Forget / Hard To Remember

> However I will say that the urge to forget would not be documented as much, because individuals won't remember the events and the changes before and after.

Only those who retained access to the memory can report it, of course. I think it probably takes two forms: A genuine discomfort in the clash between one's current experience and the prior experience, or simply that the "thread" connecting the two is weak. The more substantial the discontinuity the harder it probably is for a bridge to remain.

We can see this even in normal life: people walking through a door or other transitional experience, and not being able to remember what they were doing. A shift of attention, the context is lost, it's hard to get from "this" to "that" again. The extreme version is that you're not even aware there *is* a "that" to go looking for.

> I do actually disagree that there's no time.

We have to be a little careful here. There is no time *for the world-pattern overall* because there is no external reference point. There is only change between one part and another part. If the whole world-pattern shifts, there will be no record of it.

Parts of experience can be measured against other *parts* of experience, but overall experiences do not occur in time.

I'd say that "time" only exists in thought. We reflect upon our experiences and do so by treating memories as objects ("events") and arranging them in mental space (e.g. a "timeline"). However, there is no such space other than our thinking of it.

Multiverses vs A Shifting Dream

> I disagree that it is one dream just changing settings as well

It's really a matter of definitions and perspective. From the point of view of the experiencer, it's a dream that is changing form. Things like "multiverses" and "timelines" are just ways of *thinking-about* those changes, categorising particular shifts in experience. And remember: there is no point of view *other* than that of the experiencer. There is no available experience of standing apart and "seeing all the timelines and multiverses". They are a *faux-objective* fictional construction we use to make sense of *subjective* experience. These ideas are themselves "inside" subjective experience even though they are supposedly about an "outside" to it.

Really, all of our experiences are remarkably fluid. If we could log it in detail would discover that, in effect, each of us is living in a different world relative to one another. Our personal world-patterns are, when compared to everyone else's in fine detail, one total Mandela Effect. If we were going with the MMORPG metaphor, it would be a peer-to-peer arrangement where each of us is living in our own instantiation, with quite limited interaction with other peers - no central servers.

[...]

Since "your consciousness" *is you* - not some other thing in control of you - could you perhaps make such decisions consciously? In other words, what happens to you "normally" in these situations is likely an automatic thing in line with your current trajectory + intentions. However, if you were to deliberately make decisions in advance about what you want to happen in the event of an accident, this might influence your experience.

Reply to “[Meta + reports] Do we shape elements of our own future/universe?”

Perhaps we could say that you are 'deciding' what you want, from your own perspective, and getting it in experience: effectively, inserting facts into the world. This doesn't mean that other people have the same experience though, necessarily.

In other words, it is possible for you to discover the bike and *simultaneously* the thief to still have the bike, because all possibilities are available for experiencing?

Meanwhile, if you start looking for one theory to be true vs another, you will effectively be 'deciding' for that theory to be experienced as true, and will get that result - so it's pretty hard to disentangle what's going on.

I think it can be explained by *metaphor* but not by science or psychology, because whatever this is happens "before" observation, before things "come to be". The premonition vs decision is a difficult one, and really it doesn't matter - because every decision that comes true will become a premonition in retrospect. As long as your premonitions match your desires, no problem! :-)

[...]

> > On the most basic level, we simply make choices and take actions that will help us reach our desired outcome.

Yes, but he's talking about making decisions that produce an outcome, *without him taking any action whatsoever*.

> > Yes, also adding onto that: Also:

Both those aspects seem to be the same thing - you 'decide' something, but there isn't a resistance to it borne either from 'knowing' the opposite or from overly pondering the improbability. I'd say that not pouring over the decision is important, but I'm not convinced that the observer aspect is a problem.

Story-time: I did some experimentation for a while, after reading Neville Goddard's *The Power of Awareness* where he advocated 'overwriting' the day's errors. If I was shopping for something and was told it wasn't available, I would 'overwrite/delete' what they said and try again later. So, in a record shop (say) looking for a particular album (gettin' retro) and they say they it was a limited edition, don't stock it. Go away for a bit, 'delete', ask again. Either another staff member pipes in that he's seen it, or another customer in front will ask for it and get it and I'll get one too, or (better) the same guy will just go and get it. I called it *inserting facts into the world* and it was amazing how often the appropriate coincidence would appear - so long as you didn't ponder too much how it could happen.

Similarly: summoning people, which is a common experience reported on this subreddit in various forms. It's great to experiment with.

> > > can you elaborate on how to "delete" and "inserting facts into the world" part? im really interested!

Just... imagine you are. Change the 'feeling' of it. "That didn't happen." Fun to play with (regardless of whether it 'works' by faking your confidence or not).

...And a 'decision' could itself be considered a physical act, in that it would have a corresponding pattern in the body/mind/brain. How that would extend out into the world, of course, is another matter.

[...]

I'd say that from a 4d perspective, everything has already happened, self-consistently: your experiment has already been taken into account. You can't "cheat" this. In fact, the experiment exists only in the imagination as a "what-if" and can never really be performed or a measurement taken. This is why the 'decision' could be made even when the parents are already on their way home after doing the shopping. The apparent cause and apparent effect are pattern of a single pattern; one does not in fact lead to the other.

(The only way is to take a stand as a 5th-dimensional being, and make a change from there. However, that would affect the whole 4d landscape, such that it would remain self-consistent and no trace of the change would be apparent from the perspective of a human.)

[[Q: Yup. That is exactly the frustrating part of trying to perform experiments involving higher dimensions. John Archibald Wheeler's work basically shows that the future effects the past, so regardless of how you carry out your experiment, even if you delay your choice, the eventual act of observing the results is going to determine what happened in the past. Just like you said, you can't "cheat." The universe won't allow us to cheat.]]

Yeah! You can't even look at today to work out what you will do tomorrow, because of course that will affect what you do tomorrow. Basically, you have to treat it all as though it is a static pattern which you just happen to be experiencing sequentially. Which isn't to say your intentions don't have an influence, it's just that they have an *atemporal* influence which affects all-time - in other words, it's not possible to have a 'before record' and an 'after record' once you get to the 'after' state.

It will *always* seem as though the world is consistent. For instance, if I install a camera in the parents' car and view the food, I view this footage when they are still en-route, then if I subsequently decide it should be something different (the food), well actually the previous footage would now be consistent with this new outcome when I looked back. The *only* thing that *can* persist is memory, potentially. But more likely, that won't either (see: the strong urge-to-forget people have in glitch stories). In all other respects, the world will be "as if" the final state. And that is the trick with "glitches".

Extra thought: Even for more dramatic fare, it's a problem. Say I go to bed tonight and tomorrow I wake up...*two years ago*. I won't think I have time travelled, I'll just think I had an amazing dream, a lot of which will be predictive, but the very fact I had the dream and woke up, have expectations and doubts, means that the two years I then experience won't correspond very well to the dream.

No matter how fanciful we get, we can't cheat it due to the 'narratively-coherent static time-landscape' rule.

> And it keeps us in that same coherent cause and effect structure we're so used to.

Right. And if you are able to circumvent it - by, say, obtaining the ability to stand outside time and manipulate patterns on its (3d) 'plane' - other people will not perceive it as so. Any test will seem to be self-evident or a failure because consistency will kick in for them, even though *you* have retained a before and an after memory. So, the 'static landscape' doesn't prevent you changing things for yourself (theoretically), but it does prevent other people experiencing that change. They only experience the resultant experience.

Extra problem: Wherever there are people, there are implicit 'intentions'. So, say you manage to make things materialise and dematerialise when alone. Amazing! You bring ten people round your house to show them, all of whom have "formatted minds" that such things don't happen. So it won't happen. And if it does, they are unlikely to "see" it anyway.

TL;DR: Reality manipulation is a game you can't win, as far as everyone else is concerned. And therefore as far as you are concerned (within the parameters of acceptable "coincidence"). The rules of the world are collectively enforced.

[...]

So, it's more in tune with your 'background desires' than your 'explicit demands', you might say?

Well, there's a tradition or two of trying to leverage this 'quirk' of reality. The casualness with which you do the 'wanting' in your examples seems to correspond to the sort of thing those guys aim for ('intending an outcome and letting it go' sort of thing).

[...]

> One thing I am beginning to wonder is if we all aren't all doing this ourselves.

I'm inclined to think something along those lines. Whatever we are, we are that which *experiences* /u/lisabauer58 or /u/TriumphantGeorge. We are perhaps not those body-world-environments. In fact, maybe we don't really share this environment with anyone else, it is "all us" with us identifying with one particular aspect over another. The 'magic' seems to happen at times when we stop being so localised in that area, let out a bit, are less 'graspy' and more 'allowing'.

In other words, this is about identifying with one part of the world and not another; when we identify with the whole world, things feel like they occur 'magically'.

> [Q: I spent my whole life trying to figure out what mood inside me generates these things. I came up with the idea that the word "fey" explains it the easiest. Its when there is an inner excitement of expectation that lies beneath the surface that says what will happen is actual unimportant in the scheme of things. Its a sense of surrender and a knowing what I expect will happen. Then there are those moments that completely catch me off guard. So I think that your explanation, although similiar, is closer to explaining this phenomenon.
>
> I too actually thought about if I am the sole painter or story teller of this story. But decided I was not complicated enough to pull it off. :). We all must be connected and everyone knows the major story lines and creates details. We all came into this physical world knowing what each of us will do and the main events we were to live through.
>
> I worry about my sanity sometimes because the depths of this can unravel a persons reality. But I do know there is the One Creater and He is made of the energy love. That keeps me grounded and reminds me that I forgot on purpose the whys behind things and its best to not try and remember. That's why I say I just roll with it, those strange things that happen.]

Nice response. On the complication issue, I'd say you *are* complicated enough, it's just that you don't directly experience that complication: it is dissolved into the background. However, it does "funnel" the sensory experience you have.

I think that any influence we have comes from 'adjusting' this dissolved structure, such that subsequent experience flows along it. When we have 'precog' episodes, we are simply sensing this structure (which is non-temporal and non-spatial; it has everything-at-once, like a static landscape that you unfold moment by moment).

> Someone else may have another idea and it too is just as right as my own as they've experienced everything differently and in a different order.

Perhaps it can be said thus: that the ideas you accept become the truth you experience. In philosophical discussions, I've been dubbing metaphysics as "mind-formatting by metaphor". In other words, by accepting a descriptive framework, you enter a world aligned with it to a certain extent.

- Experiences leave traces which *in-form* subsequent experiences.
- Thoughts are also experiences, and so also lead to *in-form-ation*, as it were.

The world you experience is a matter of *habits*. There is no solid substrate to experience, no "rules". Only patterns that have become stable enough that they funnel experience along particular routes.

In his classic essay, *SSOTBME: An Essay on Magic*, Ramsay Dukes suggests that the 'magician' influences his world by declaring something as true (how things 'are') and then experiencing the evidence. (Whereas a scientist goes looking at experience as it currently is, and takes *that* as evidence for what is true.)

> I do believe when we die we will know. :)

There are tales of people whose dying words are "It's so simple!". I don't think you need to die though; I think if you enter a state of 'allowing' then you can detach somewhat from the personalised experience. I guess OBEs (and even lucid dreams) are along those lines, and offer insight. Every night, we dream a universe via hypnagogia:

- Random sparkles > partial shapes > object fragments > dream world

So, if we assume for the moment that what I experience is something like 'raw random creativity' funnelled through the 'format of my mind', where does that leave "other people"?

[...]

Extra bit: One other issue with the 'other people contribute too' idea is that many reports of changes of a deliberate nature seem to (if true) have side-effects, such as other people's personalities and tastes changing, even their appearance. Which makes sense: if houses and other objects shift and change, why not people too?

However, it does cause a problem: If your intentions and activities cause the whole of experience to shift including people, that means those people can't be intending your experience. (Further investigation might suggest there are no people at all, just an 'awareness' and experiences within it, dream-like.)

> Exactly. :)

I'm so pleased you have accepted me as your One True God! ;-)
I promise to be benevolent and merciful!

[...]

Well, hasn't this turned out to be an interesting post thread? Prayers repeated are basically "mind-formatting". The wording does, I think, count. (No 'wanting', only 'declaration' or 'wishing that *will* happen'.) So you do have to be careful.

One thing though: In your scheme, what are "other people" and how come they can be 'shifted and adjusted' along with any apparent glitches that occur?

P.S. Extra points for the new word "coincidii"!

> I'm a big believer in the 'cosmic consciousness' which I believe links us all!

I'm inclined to think that "consciousness" is the basic "stuff" of the universe, and everything else is patterned structures within it. So, no matter what, things are fundamentally "one thing, always and everywhere" - just as, say, waves might be located but "water" or "blue" is simultaneously everywhere. Basically, philosophical idealism of the non-dual sort.

> [«Nondualism, also called nonduality, is a polyvalent term originating in Indian philosophy and religion, where it is used in various, related contemplative philosophies which aim to negate dualistic thinking or conceptual proliferation (prapanca) and thereby realize nondual awareness, 'that which is beyond discursive thinking', a state of consciousness described in contemplative traditions as a background field of unified, immutable awareness that exists prior to conceptual thought.
>
> The English term "nonduality" is derived from the Sanskrit Hindu term "advaita" (अद्वैत), "not-two" or "one without a second," meaning that only Brahman, 'the one', is ultimately real while 'the world', or the multiplicity of thought-constructs, 'the second', is not fully real; and from the Buddhist term advaya, which is also literally translated as "not two" and has various applications, including the Madhyamaka negation of thinking in opposites such as ordinary, conventional truth versus ultimate truth, and in Yogachara the deconstruction of the "apprehension of sensory objects as separate from the perceiving consciousness."»
>
> «Subjective idealism, or empirical idealism or immaterialism, is a form of philosophical monism that holds that only minds and mental contents exist. It entails and is generally identified or associated with immaterialism, the doctrine that material things do not exist. Subjective idealism rejects dualism, neutral monism, and materialism; it is the contrary of eliminative materialism, the doctrine that all or some classes of mental phenomena (such as emotions, beliefs, or desires) do not exist, but are sheer illusions.»
>
> - Wikipedia: Nondualism, Subjective Idealism]

Thoughts are experiences. Whether they tend to lead other, similar experiences to follow their lead, it's quite possible. The whole New Thought era - Neville Goddard - was built upon this, but he was the only one to recognise that it was the generation of the *feeling of being in a situation* which 'set the goal' for having a subsequent experience.

> We are a type of 'receiver' for this 'energy' to flow to and through and we can 'direct' it in the ways we want, which is why our 'thoughts' create the world/s we live in

I think we're going to shift from seeing ourselves as 'bodies in the world' and to 'whatever it is that is aware'. Experiences and thoughts leave traces which in-form subsequent experiences and thoughts, I reckon, so you do end up with a sort of self-stabilising experiential world.

Basically, *directed* thinking is equivalent to "mind-formatting". This is not the same as *thinking-about* though, which is pondering stuff. Rather, this is about adopting a 1st-person experience equivalent to normal experience and having it 'set a goal' for you as a result. (The feedback loop then makes it impossible, strictly speaking, to say whether you have adjusted the world or adjusted yourself; to you they are the same thing.)

> p.s that Neville Goddard stuff is interesting, I have thought like this for a long time!

He's got an interesting take on it. If nothing else, it's thought-provoking. And if you ponder a bit what the extreme version of it would be... what if you fully visualise and don't come back...

> p.p.s do you like sci-fi?

Yeah, much. It's great for getting the mind going on more abstract topics. (Example: using the idea of time-travel to explore what experience is and being a person means.) Philip K Dick's ponderings on the flexibility and transparency of reality particularly - I like his short stories too - and there've been lots of low-budget interesting films and TV series of late (*Coherence*, *Frequencies*, *Predestination*, that new *Parallels* show might be good).

To clarify, I don't think we receive or transmit anything; I think **we *are* everything.** We sometimes get confused by the fact that we don't experience everything *in expanded, sensory mode* all the time; but everything is still there, dissolved into the background of our awareness like a coloured dye dissolved into water.

Reply to “[Theory] Why do we only hear "quantum immortality" stories from the "immortal" person's point of view? Why do we never hear "my loved one had a brush with death and now they insist that Thing used to be way X when it's always been way Y"?”

> [Q: I have a difficulty with quantum immortality, as it has been told to me:
>
> > If I jump into another reality when I come close to death, then in that other reality people may see me as dead, right? But in the new reality, what was going on with me for the duration that I was in the old reality? Did I just take over someone else's experience and life? Did I kill them? Even if you want to say they are both me, and I'm just switching camera views or something, it still stands that the person in the new reality was having conscious experiences before I took them over, and now they are not. Unless you want to say that we are both sharing conscious experiences, but without knowledge of the other one sharing them. So which conscious experience is controlling the action? And if that body in the new reality has a near death experience, then it must jump to a new reality, and now you have 3 conscious experiences of 1 bodily experience and none have a right to control that experience. This could happen over and over again, with more and more consciousnesses occupying one body. If you want to say that the new reality doesn't exist until you jump into it, then you must assume that nothing in your experience is really there, and be a solipsist.
>
> Anyways, I just don't think it makes any sense. :/]

A way out of this is to stop assuming that the format of the world is of a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time". If instead, we are dealing with a pre-existing collection of "all possible sensory moments" across which we scan our attention, then we no longer have the problem of new and old realities and taking over people's lives. There are no people, as such, only *that-which-experiencess*. And there is nothing "happening" other than *experiencing-of-moments*.

Other realities aren't places, they are static moments. They don't "happen" when you are not experiencing them.

This is solipsism is the sense that "only *mind* exists and all possible experiences are within it", but it is not the same as saying only *me-as-person* exists, and so is less problematic I think.[1] In fact, it ties up nicely with your actual direct experience: all that you ever experience of the so-called "external world" arises within your "open aware mind-space"; this includes all your thoughts *about* the "external world"; you never experience any boundary to your mind-space. So, the evidence supports this view in terms of the *context* of experience. The *content* of experience is actually irrelevant in a way, since in this view it becomes a sort of "3-dimensional sensory theatre" drawn from an eternal record, which can't tell you anything about "how things are really" (the context).

Finally, there is therefore no fundamental reason why an experiencer can't skip to a set of moments whose content conflicts with previously experienced moment. Integrity with respect to history is at best a habit of moment-selection, not a rule attached to a "universe" as such. And this may even mean having experiences of commenting on subreddits about how our experiences conflict...

[1] There could be any number of "experiencers" in theory. However, it makes no sense to talk of experiences happening at "the same time and place", since "times" and "places" are aspects of an experience, and are meaningless outside of an experience. Also, all experiencers would be identical really - all just an open *experiencing-awareness* - so there would be only one of them in effect, since *experiencing-awareness* would be "before" division, contrast and multiplicity. Hence an alternative phrasing: you will "eventually" have all possible experiences and everyone is effectively you, although not at the same time. Although also: kinda at the same time.

> it is because time and location are aspects of experience that it makes perfect sense to speak of them in relation to experience, especially if you want to make argument s about how experience could shift between worlds.

Doesn't this separate "the world" from "experience", however? Note: I'm not saying that discussing things in terms of time and space is *pointless*, only that it is not *meaningful* to talk of time and space "between experiences".

Actually, it's probably beneficial if we rename "time and space" as "change and division" when referring to experience itself. To have an experience *of* something, those are requirements. And so to have an experience *of* a "world", the content of our experience must be so-formatted. What we tend to call "time and space" is really something we infer from the experience of "change and division".

Anyway, the footnote is emphasising two things: First, that some of the difficulties people encounter when thinking of solipsism arise due to thinking about the *context* as if it were *content*. Second, that it is not meaningful to talk of shifting worlds using the language of worlds themselves. For as long as we are thinking of a world as a "place" that is "out there", treating that *as the fundamental truth*, then we will misunderstand the nature of experience and so of world-shifting. It may be *relative* truth (you have an experience "as if" such-and-such was the case), but the *fundamental* truth is unchanged (of an *aware-experiencer* who is having an experience of *being-a-world-from-the-perspective-of-a-person*).

For example, say the house next door is painted *red* and the guy who owns it is called "Robert" (and everyone calls him by his full name because he hates contractions). One day, I wake up and see that the house is *blue*. I notice that everyone calls the owner "Bobby". Everyone claims that these two facts have always been the "new way" and only I remember differently. It is "as if" I have switched universes!

But what does that actually mean?

Well, what I actually experienced was a discontinuity in the content of by experience. I didn't actually experience "switching universes", that's just something I infer from a conceptual framework I have. In fact, the notion that I am even "in a world" is *also* something I infer from a conceptual framework. The notion that the room next door is "over there" assumes that the world is formatted like - is a continuation of the formatting of - my ongoing experience. And even then, only a part of my ongoing experience (since it is relatively easy to have spaceless-timeless experiences).

What are the implications of that?

It simply means that it is *meaningless* (but not *pointless*) to talk of time and space between worlds, or of worlds being "located" in any way - because a "world" is a concept inferred from a collection of similarly-structured moments, rather than a place.

In truth, if I pay attention, my actual experience is of being an "open aware space" with a constantly changing "3D multi-sensory image" floating in it, one aspect of which I've fallen into the habit of calling "me", and the rest "my body" and "the world". Anything beyond that involves thinking in terms of "the view from nowhere", which immediately means I am "already wrong" since that objective view can never be experienced; it does not exist. It is a connective fiction, an abstraction. Again, that doesn't mean it isn't useful - but for *structuring* purposes rather than finding the truth of the situation.

I'd say it's not that there can''t be a discussion about it - it's just a matter of being honest with ourselves about the nature of our descriptions?

I don't think we benefit from viewing our abstractions as *actually true* rather than being *fitting narratives*. It can even lead to us defending things which are essentially fictions, after they have outlived their usefulness. When talking about this stuff, I think we reach the limit of the fiction of the "objective world" container, and we have to adjust our approach accordingly.

As you indicate, if we insist that our narrative about "what is going on" must be in terms of "time and locational and individual experience" - *even though we will never be able to make a direct observation to confirm this* - then we might be effectively preventing ourselves from creating a useful narrative. We may even be making some experiences completely unexplainable in terms of our ability to create a model. It's like only looking for your lost keys under the streetlight, even though you have no idea where you dropped them!

I think 'glitch' experiences and 'quantum immortality' models are very vulnerable to this - hence all these "what happens to the people in the other timeline?" questions and similar. Those questions aren't actually questions based on experiences, they are questions based on a certain conceptual diagram (the timeline) or two (the cartesian co-ordinate system) which has been *conflated with* individual experience. It's the assumptions of the model that is creating the problem, and in this case those happen to correspond to unexamined assumptions about the nature of experience itself...

So, where does that leave us?

Actually it probably leaves us with more possibilities for coming up with explanations that connect to direct experience than ever before. Because we:

1. Treat the unchanging *context* of experience as fundamental (our "open aware perceptual space").
2. Treat the changing *content* of experience as primary (the 3D-sensory experience that arises within perception).
3. Recognise that everything beyond this is a *connective fiction* with a certain number of observational touch-points.

Freed from treating our abstractions as actually true, we are also freed from requiring that the *nature* of experience and the *structure* of experience must correspond to the format of the *content* of experience. (Avoiding the reification of abstractions, basically.)

Reply to “[Theory] Reality is a rendering. It is only in what is rendered that physical matter appears to exist.”

[[OP (Ian Wilson): Some of you already will know this, others are still in a paradigm or belief that may make this fact seem alien or like science fiction. You are what this system renders you to be...

What is a rendering? It is when a computer processes data and turns it into a final composition like we see in today's video games and 3D animated movies. Before you dismiss that you exist in the rendered output of information, let me prove to you with 100% fact that will be undeniable that you do exist in a rendered production; where information has been processed and composed into this final product you call reality. To really see in action how information plays a role in describing reality, we need to look no further then our own perceptions of reality. The human body uses 5 senses that interpret information that is then converted into electro-chemical signals sent to the brain for processing. The brain interprets this information and outputs our view of reality based on sensory inputs. This output that we have is our experience of reality. It is the final rendered product base on information gathered by sensory organs, processed by the brain and rendered into an interface which allows you to interact with the outside world. The simple self evident test to see this in action is to simply close your eyes and shutting out one sensory input stops the visual information from rendered. This is an example of how nature has evolved a system by which to process information and turn it into a virtual reality. If you need an example of what a virtual reality appears as, look no further than your own perception of reality. Now how do we know if physical reality itself is also a virtual reality? We assume because it creates solid particles and has chronological time and consistency, that it is outside of this personal process of information processing and rendering yet in quantum mechanics we can see the very strong evidence that physical matter is not as it appears to be.

The double-slit experiment has revealed that sub-atomic particles such as electrons and photons behave as both a particle and a wave. This is known as particle/wave duality. The criteria that determines if the sub-atomic particle should be a particle is measurement. When we measure or observe the particle it behaves like a solid object. When the particle is not being measured or observed it behaves like a probability distribution and creates the wave interface pattern. Waves of energy are not solid. They are not particles. So why is this behaviour observed in matter and revealed in the double-slit experiment? Why can a photon, or electron become a particle, then return to a wave or vice-versa? If it was a solid particle, it should always be a solid particle. There should never be this dualism. The answer to the observer effect and the measurement problem is answered when you look at information. Think of matter as data first. It is information. The information described the attributes of matter. Like all data, it must be accessed then the attributes that describe it must be rendered. The criteria for measurement is data access.

In the double-slit experiment when we observe the data, the system must [b]render[/b] the particle. When that data is not being accessed, the system doesn't need to render it rather it adheres to a law of information conservation. The law of information conservation in a virtual reality prevents the system from rendering all the data all the time, conserving processing to only the data that is being accessed at any given point. The particle collapses from wave-function only when the system is rendering the particle. It is not wave-function collapse rather information processing and the final rendered output.

The particle behaviour found in the double-slit experiment answers itself properly when you apply virtual reality theory and it is an expected behaviour in a virtual reality. We would not see that behaviour if particles were really solid state objects. Now bear in mind, it's not just sub-atomic particles that exhibit particle/wave duality. This has been observed in entire atoms and molecules. The carbon atom for example has been observed being both an interference pattern (wave) and a particle. Carbon-60 molecules known as Bucky Balls produce this behaviour. Really let that soak in. That a solid atom like a carbon atom isn't always solid. It too can be a probability distribution in the form of a wave. Right there you should question the very nature of reality as being a physical matter world as we believe. Science tells us that this isn't really the case. If both sub-atomic particles and atomic particles flip/flop from solid to wave where the criteria for solid behaviour is measurement; then what we are really looking at is information that is being rendered when accessed via measurement.

This is because physical reality really is a genuine virtual reality. And that isn't going to change based on our beliefs regarding what reality is. It has always been this way, and will always be this way. The only difference is which paradigm you are in that describes what you believe it to be. Reality is information. Information that needs to be accessed and rendered in order to produce the experience of reality which we have all thrived in since our birth. At the heart of our existence lies this relationship between information and the observer.

This is why, you do not live in a physical world rather you live in a rendered reality. There is a big difference between the two ideas. Which of the two do you really want to believe in? Could the outside world really be information and data? Are you just interpreting this data and rendering it's attributes to produce your experience with that data? Think about a 3D first-person video game. The game is nothing more than a complex set of rules that describe the game world which sits as information on a computer. On the computer screen, you see a vivid 3D world where a character makes choices based on these rules which define the game. What makes the world appear 3D is the attributes of data being rendered into an interface that you the player interact through. The computer doesn't need to render all the objects described in the game world all at once, rather it only needs to render what is relative to the character in that world. The location in the game world, the perspective are all mathematical vectors which are the attributes that describe what the character sees. This is the law of information conservation at work in games. If the computer had to render all the data the processing power would be too great and also wasteful. It's more efficient to just render what is needed to describe what the player sees. Time in a video game is simply the sequence of rendered frames refreshed over and over again as the data changes. Space in a video game is Cartesian where XYZ coordinates track width, length and depth. The space the character sees exists only in the rendering but at the information level is very very small. What ever drive space needed to store that information, or memory allocations to handle the changes in that information.

Our reality based also on information is also similar to this model. Time is the animated sequences of change in data from one frame to the next. Space is also Cartesian in that we render space but the information that describes space is very very small, to the point that it could be sub-atomic in scale. At this meta-level of reality where data describes our Universe it could all exist in the event horizon of a singularity if we look at the Holographic Principle.

In the final example that sets in stone the role that virtual reality plays in our existence there is another realm by which information creates a visual 3D environment. This realm is observed through dreaming. Dreams are another example of how information created by the brain can produce a vivid virtual dream reality.

When we sleep and emerge into a vivid 3D dream environment, that world is yet another powerful example of how virtual reality is playing a role in our experiences. If you reject that the physical world is a virtual reality, but can accept that your perception of it is a virtual recreation, then dreams would be the 2 out of 3 examples of virtual reality at work in your own life experiences.

The physical world as a virtual reality may be a hard pill to swallow but it is one that shouldn't be ignored just because you see all of it rendered in all of it's splendour. Brian Whitworth presents a very compelling paper that examines the physical world as a virtual reality.

Take it for what it's worth... if you really want to understand what reality is, don't ignore the role that virtualism plays in it's grand equation.]]

Okay, some good essentials there, but I worry that the metaphor drowns out the actual core understanding? As I see it, the basics of our world are:

- Our experiences take the form of the senses, which *includes* the sense of spatial extension and temporal evolution.
- The *world-as-it-truly-is*, is more akin to dimensionless "facts" dissolved into the background - a metaphorical landscape which we traverse with our attention.
- What we are is "that which experiences", hence anything we experience (images of brains, etc) is not us. We are not brains, and brains do not interpret anything - they are part of the picture.

To say we live in a "virtual reality" is really just to say that we don't sensorily experience the world as it truly is. We might call this "information" but really it is nothing that corresponds to concepts such as this. However you imagine it, it is not. In fact, any metaphorical scheme we use - simulations, or whatever - is just a way of having visualisable concepts to *think-about* relationships. It is not "true", right?

Reality seems to be a memory-like "patterning process".

Metaphor itself seems to shape experience, in fact, which makes pinning the whole thing down even trickier! This results in a dream-like aspect, as particularly highlighted when you actively explore the synchronistic process. This self-reflecting aspect is what gives rise to glitches, perhaps.

> > Virtual reality as a term does sound very artificial to something as dynamic and self-evolved our reality.

It's just that it has associations in fiction and technology. It's a metaphor, sure, but I'm weary of the number of time people assert they are *literally* living in a computer situation after reading about the "information universe" or whatever. I do understand the motivation.

"Information" can be a bit of a vague term too. I prefer talking about *facts-of-the-world* or similar, experiential patterns, mind-formatting, something that evokes specifics, but it's really audience-dependent.

> > What you said about experience and the one having them I believe is very fundamental to who we are relative to the ones having the experiences. Reality does cater to experience however that equates itself in this process.

I'm inclined to say that we cannot know what we are, as an object. We "become" our experiences. Usually we identify with one bit of experience vs the rest, but interestingly we can change which bits we identify with...

When you have a precog dream, where are you? Are you "really" in your body but seeing an image of the future (by unpacking the "information" in the background)? Or is whatever-you-are just unfolding another "next-moment" after which it will unfold "this-moment". Only when we return did it seem to happen from *here*. If you disconnected from *here* completely...

> Precognition can be looked at as a template for the future...

Yes. I'm inclined to think it is the *actual* future as it is at the time we perceive it precoggily (new word).

> a blueprint as part of a creative process where we are in fact creating the future event during this but for the most part unconscious of the process or our involvement.

Yes. If time is a landscape, then in everyday expereince are "attention" following a trajectory across it. Every imaginative intention we have, I propose, applies to the whole landscape at once. So we are continually updating the future and the past, blindly. In a precognitive dream or other intuition, however, we have opened up our attention to encompass more than just one moment, and can knowingly update while experiencing the change occur - in "advance" as it were.

I've been experimenting a little with this, via patterning and synchronciity. An assertive summary on *The Patterning of Experience;* general idea is that *in effect* all time and space is available to imagination.

EDIT: Elsewhere you said "literal dreamworld". That's basically it, I say ***the world is literally imagination.*** Your experience works on an "as if" basis. As if there is a timeline, as if there is extended space, as if there are "facts" of the world, and so on - whenever you implicitly *imagine that* something is true, it is. (Not the same as belief.) Really there is just the sensory arising in awareness, consistent with implicit facts, and nothing else behind it. Make a change to those facts, experience will immediately fall into alignment with the update - as if it had always been true. This makes experimentation quite challenging.

[...]

> There would still need to be another Outside the Outside. And thus it continues.

I don't think there does need to be "games inside games". If you are "an aware space" which connects to game environments, the game-character-perspective appearing within your consciousness, you get out of the Russian Doll Problem. If I switch TV channels, the second channel isn't contained within the first channel.

> When can we change the details where the others wouldn't object as they too are connected to the events you've materialized?

It depends upon whether the "game" has simple world-sharing model or a more complex one. The common description of consensus reality being like a room full of people where we all collectively choose the decor, for instance, isn't a good one.

It's more like we are each in our own virtual room, with some overlap between other rooms *when the intentions of those occupants coincide with our own.*

> And what is the purpose of the game?

No purpose apart from experiencing-exploring. When confronted by eternity, you realise there is no final state.

[...]

> [Q: Nice writeup. You should read up on Emmanuel Kant and his philosophy of phenomena and noumena as well as Bishop Berkeley's "brain in a vat". What you wrote seems to be a synthesis of the two.]

I'd say that a read of Berkeley's *Three Dialogues* might give him the missing jump. I never read Kant (for no reason I can discern!) but his description of space and time in transcendental idealism is agreeable to me:

> [The salient element here is that space and time, rather than being real things-in-themselves or empirically mediated appearances (German: Erscheinungen), are the very forms of intuition (German: Anschauung) by which we must perceive objects. They are hence neither to be considered properties that we may attribute to objects in perceiving them, nor substantial entities of themselves. They are in that sense subjective, yet necessary, preconditions of any given object insofar as this object is an appearance and not a thing-in-itself. Humans necessarily perceive objects as located in space and in time. This condition of experience is part of what it means for a human to cognize an object, to perceive and understand it as something both spatial and temporal. . .
>
> . . .Kant's view is better characterized as a two-aspect theory, where noumena and phenomena refer to complementary ways of considering an object.]

So thanks for that tip.

Reply to “[THEORY] Theory of Convergence”

> [OP: Not so much time travel as parallel universes running at the same time. The key word is parallel.
>
> Example: in one universe, "you" are eating a bag of corn chips, while in another, parallel, universe, "you" are eating potato chips. You finish at the same time, and toss your wrappers in the bin the same way. You then look in the bin and think, "hmm, I thought I ate corn/potato chips, when the wrapper says they were potato/corn chips. Weird." And then you go on with your day. Your memory fumbles with the moment because at one time both were correct, then you shrug it off. If there are millions of divergences, then there must be millions of convergences, the interesting part of it being we would merge with universes already much like our own, but not with a universe where it's a Mad Max style apocalyptic wasteland (and don't even think about it!). As to the mechanism that would cause the merge, I have zero idea, much as we don't know exactly why they diverge.
>
> Your thoughts?]

Why do the universes need to be "running"?

Could you not instead have a static set of patterns, and it is you experiencing them that "runs" the content, which "happens" the happening, so to speak? Universes then become different *states* rather than different *places* - different distributions or sets of contributions of potential "facts".

Given that we never actually experience a divergence or a convergence - we only experience changes within our own perceptual space - is it not simpler to envisage this as a set of possible states which we attach to or unfold within ourselves? Like the configuration space described in Julian Barbour's *The End of Time* combined with David Bohm's implicate and explicate orders - or an *Infinite Grid of All Possible Moments*.

Basically, I'm questioning the assumption that the world is of the same format as our experience; suggesting that spatial extent and temporal change are artefacts of experience itself. So, *experiencing* is dynamic, meaning that the universe doesn't have to be; it just has to contain all possible (coherent) states.

Or "changes in state", perhaps.

(I'm not sure I'd call it *personal* perception as such, maybe *subjective* though. Although once you've done that, the notion of "subjective" changes, I'd say.)

I think our confusion about "glitches" and our resorting to things like "many-worlds" - nonscientific but with the feel of "scienceiness" - arises from confusing our thoughts *about* things, our abstractions, with their actual nature. So long as we realise they are metaphors, then that's not a problem, but we do tend to treat them as literally true. You will never see a parallel universe. You will never even see yourself, in fact. If, in glitches, we are talking about something which appears to be a *fundamental* shift, then it makes sense to return to the fundamentals of our experience in order to examine it, rather than stop at a sort of halfway point. (The halfway point being: to continue to view the world to be as it appears in sensory experience, and building out from there, rather than digging into he *nature* of that experiencing.)

Returning to *experience*, then what we call "a parallel universe" is really a *discontinuity of experience* which we explain to ourselves using the fiction or metaphor of "parallel universes". Parallel universe are the abstract description, not the reality. So, taking experience as our starting point, we might end up with the following "scale of explanation", in terms of how it seems to us based on the level of discontinuity:

- conf. bias > coincidence > synchronicity > "manifestation" > world shifting > "jumping universes"

As you are noticing, problem is that the true situation is literally unthinkable - because our thoughts themselves arise as 'space and time' experiences, whilst the fundamental situation is "before" division and change. Where is space and time before we "run" an experience of space and time? But if we take a step back and keep things abstract, *knowing* that we are using metaphors, then we can make something workable that isn't misleading.

> > Look at it two ways. There's either a collective overworked interpretation of data and experience... or the world is a magical place where weird shit happens.

Or why not look at it both those ways at once? :-)

We are not so far apart as you might imagine. It's all about where we think the "magic" is. Usually in our descriptions we are inclined to place the magic at certain levels of the *content* of experience. I suggest that the magic is actually the foundational level - and by recognising its place there then we get all the benefits!

All the metaphors people use are different attempts to describe the relationship between the objective and the subjective. Hence the computer or simulation metaphor's "data + processor", and all the other versions of "landscape + doer". This tends to make one aspect alive and the rest not; the generalised version is "dead + alive". But the proper approach is one which recognises there is no division, that the doer *takes on the shape of* the landscape. For example:

The Blanket Metaphor

Imagine that there is blanket of material. The only property of this blanket is "awareness". When flat, the experience of this blanket is *"existence"*. Now, the blanket *shape-shifts* itself into a pattern of folds. The experience of the blanket is now the experience of itself *"being-this-shape"*. The blanket may even come to identify itself with some of those folds and not others, perhaps because they change more slowly than the rest and seem consistent, calling them "me".

So we have that the *content* of experience is the folds in the blanket (this includes the "formatting" of experience: spatial extent, sensory streams, and so on), but the *nature* of experience is the blanket itself. The set of folds can be described by metaphors (patterns, states and so on), however the blanket or the property of "awareness" cannot, since it is fundamental.

This is why structural metaphorical descriptions seem so "dead" even though they are the most flexible and nearer to the truth: our notion of "aliveness" is associated with complex content, *movement* basically. In fact, however, the "magic" is baked in at ground level, which is why even the background quiet of a peaceful moment is filled with "aliveness". It is "awareness" that breathes fire into the patterns of potential experience which are dissolved within it.

> > You should run this idea through some of the physics subreddits and see where they can take it.

Well, the point is that this is *before* scientific observation: it is philosophy and metaphysics. As indeed the many-worlds interpretation is. There's nothing scientific about it - but that's not a dismissal, it just means it's not intersubjectively verifiable as a model. You can do things to explore it subjectively, however. Which is where...

(Yeah, it's great that story, isn't it?)

...it can indeed explain that story, but you have to go to the full patterning model to do it. I'm pushed for time right now, but here's a limited description: *The Patterning of Experience*. The most important notion is to recognise that the world is not a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time" and is more like a toy box of potential experiential patterns "dissolved" into the background. In other words, the full picture is a little more subtle that the convenient "moment" divisions that the *Infinite Grid* metaphor outlines, and more like a complete set of patterns or "facts" or "formatting", with different levels of contribution.

Reply to “[THEORY] So my problem with quantum immortality is, what happens to the "you" that was already living in the universe you end up in?”

There isn't a "you" there.

What you are experiencing now is like a pre-recorded memory, from a library which contains all possible memories, of all possible events, from all possible perspectives. Currently you are exploring the /u/lilzilla "moments" of this world, following a trajectory of experiences, one after the other, that follow from each other. If you die, it's just like you've hit the end of a plausible trajectory of memories or "moments". Your attention then jumps discontinuously to another "moment".

Everyone's experience is like this... only they are experiencing from other viewpoints. In fact, it's possible that multiple "consciousnesses" are experiencing the same moment as you are...

[...]

> The universe you end up in did not even exist until you got there.

Maybe better to say it doesn't exists "as an experience", but it exists as an implied pattern. Even your current universe doesn't exists as a spatially-extended world. The space you perceive around you right now is part of your sensing. The unseen parts of your world are just dimensionless "facts" dissolved into the background, until you attend to them.

(This gets around the whole "create a whole universe every decision" thing.)

From other people's perspectives, they might be experiencing a visible "you" in any number of situations. However, the conscious-being-that-is-really-you isn't "looking through" any of those.

[...]

> [Q: Wow. There's an awful lot of... let's be charitable and say 'confusion' in these replies. It looks like no one here actually understands QI. The way the Many Worlds Interpretation works is that every time a new quantum interaction takes place, a new "world" (systems with correlated quantum states) splits partially off the old one; 'partially' because it's limited by how that information is transmitted (see the 'Wigner's Friend' corollary to Schroedinger's Cat). In QI, the same thing happens. When the system called "your body" interacts with and becomes correlated with the system called "poison vial" or "out of control truck", the systems go into superposition and you become dead in one part of the outcome and alive in another. And it's not anything to do with the decisions you make - it happens every time quantum information is created through interactions. Every second there are quadrillions of "yous" splitting into alternate, equally real, worlds. So, let's say you decide to get into a QI suicide booth. Every second that's going by, zillions of you are being created. (And don't go thinking you're special here. Don't imagine you at the middle with alternayous splitting away. You are just another branch from a younger you.) By being in the booth, you constrain any future yous to worlds were the quantumly improbable has occured: the vial didn't smash. There's no "there" there until you get there. And when you do, you're as much you and you normally are. The millions of you that walk out of the

> booth (at slightly different times and with subtlely different quantum states - heat distribution, say) will *all* remember being the same single individual you that walked in.
>
> ALL of them will be "the real you". This in no way requires physicalism, by any means. But it does mean that the soul/mind/aenima vitae/what-have-you, if such exists, is similarly fractally fractious. It has nothing to do with p-zombies (or 'zimbos' - the term I always preferred) - you don't need to animate a preexisting body, you just create a new one, like you always do. Questions of identity and free will become radically changed - ie. "Yes, there's some world out there where Mother Teresa snapped and gunned down a marketplace. But those worlds are very rare compared to the ones where she tried to help people". And note: this is a little different than Egan's "Dust" perspective, which would allow zimbo animation if it was an effective way to maintain an internally consistent world, but the OP was explicitly asking about QI. (Of course, both systems may be operative. I suspect they are, frankly.)
>
> Tl;dr - you don't 'go' to a new universe when you survive, you *create* it. And this is a normal and common thing to happen.]

Nicely put!

Generally, I think these descriptions are slightly better *without* the quantum mechanics element - it is enough that there are multiple "experience-sets" and that what your are is not identified with any one of them. The temporal-bound idea of things actually splitting in time, rather than being there, confuses things, since it is a view from "inside", just as the idea of states and interactions are, when the view from "outside" is more akin to an eternal structure or pattern in which all possibilities are available equally. But, y'know, details. There are a hundred ways of saying the same thing in different terminology, and of holding one part "stable" while describing the movements of the other parts!

Currently (speaking as a former physicist) the many-worlds interpretation is just one of several dubious interpretations of quantum mechanics. Quantum mechanics is basically a mathematical description the makes predictions. It works. The "what it means" has been up for grabs for a long time. Even the idea of it being "probabilities" is itself an interpretation. (Without a hidden variables-based view, it quickly becomes un-think-out-able except as a mathematics-inspired fantasy, and our passion for locality presents a hurdle.) Max Born took a very "it's just the maths" view of the whole endeavour.

Quantum Immortality is not a scientific theory, it is a (fine) philosophical meandering extrapolated from this. It cannot be "proved" because by the very nature of it, it comes "before" science. There is no evidence for it; it's basically unfalsifiable. But that's okay, because what we are trying to describe is *conscious experience* here, to provide an "explanatory fiction" for certain people's subjective anecdotes, not something that can be observed objectively.

Short version: QM is maths, used but not understood, and people are still trying to come up with understandable physics from it even now (and the axioms used in that approach are just as arbitrary and unfounded as anything that came before).

EDIT: Sorry, that sounded a bit snippy! But the circularity of talking about jumping worlds based on observations that take place *within* one of those worlds is confused. It's fine to take the *possible* idea of "hey there are different possibilities existing at once, we could flip between them", but to say that is *the actual nature of things behind the scenes* is a bit of a stretch.

Reply to “[THEORY] Shared Fading Reality Theory for Mandela Effect - Not Quantum Shift”

I like the phrasing of "fading" reality. But then I'm biased, because I love the "world as memory" and "experience as associative recall" way of thinking about these things!

So something like:

- The *facts-of-the-world* aren't inherently stable because they are not bound to some solid substrate.
- They are perhaps (in effect) shifted by the behaviour of people, by what their behaviour *implies* is true.
- Previous *facts-of-the-world* can be forgotten through neglect, and replaced by new assertions or assumptions.

The extra rule is: The world-state must always be self-consistent, so if a fact drifts then from that point on all future experiences will be consistent with that new state. Only personal memories *may* remain.

Some further ideas on how to approach thinking about the Mandela Effect...

So, what's our base assumption here?

It's that when we observe something, the observation corresponds to a "measurement" of a persistent thing which exists independently of the observation. But in fact, we never experience the "persistent thing", we only experience *apparent persistence* - i.e. when we perform a similar measurement later, we obtain the same result. The "external object" is a story-making fiction, an abstraction, to link these two observations together. And even this is too far! Because if the measurement changed all the time we would never observe persistence and we would never infer an object in the first place.

In other words, all that there is is experiences, some experiences repeat, those repetitions we call "objects". We then complain when a later observation contradicts an earlier series of observations, because that means the object changed. But there never *was* an object, only a collection of similar patterns of experience which we grouped together and called "object".

How come apparent persistence?

When certain patterns persist in experience, it is simply because those patterns were maintained in the mind - perhaps because they were more intense, perhaps because they were intertwined with other patterns which maintained them. At the time of experiencing, and observation is a "fact" which becomes interconnected with its context. The tendency is for an observed pattern to slowly fade and become diffuse, however it is supported by the larger mesh of patterns which maintain it for as long as some part of the context remains active. This means that *changes in the larger context can accidentally shift the shape of the persisting pattern*. When we re-measure that pattern (by re-triggering that experience in its context) we find that it has been altered, like a memory that has been polluted.

Relevance to Mandela Effect?

The so-called Mandela Effect is simply that current experiences no longer match previous experiences. The person infers that the object of the effect has changed.

However, there never was an object, there was only a memory-like after-image of the earlier observation which was being re-triggered. Other shifts in the wider context can deform that after-image so that when we revisit the context, it *seems* that the world changed. But really it's the *world-pattern* or *world-memory* that changed. (There isn't an actual stable external world in the first place.)

But don't I see objects, here, now?

No. Over time, you have accumulated many "impressions" and through natural patterning those impressions which share context (time, space, sub-patterns) become strongly interconnected. There is no "object" other than a word you have assigned to a certain "clumpiness" to the patterning of your experience. Objects are *ideas* linked to accumulated, superpositions of experiential patterns. Objects apparently persist because patterns never go away, they are just triggered into "brightness" when the surrounding context activates them. All previous observations or impressions are right here, now, just very dim (like the stars in the daytime sky).

The "room you are in now" is, essentially, an immersive multi-sensory 3D thought that was re-triggered by the experiential pattern of "walking through that door". (The room "next door" is here, now, just very dim. You can re-trigger it be *recalling* the experiential pattern of "walking back through".)

On The Fly

> Could it be that our personal realities get filled in "on the fly"?

Yes! We might say that everything exists "logically" prior to our encountering it, as an ongoing superposition of information. All the prior observations, to the extent that you are committed to them, contribute to your eventual observation of France.

When you actually make a "France observation", this logical state becomes intensified, more defined, and therefore more stable, more "factual".

Pattern Shift Reasons

> What would be the reason for this pattern shift then? Does originate from within the individual or a shared world.

The "reason" for pattern-shifts isn't necessarily meaningful in terms of objects or context. Imagine a blanket on a table. The blanket isn't flat, it has random ripples and folds. I place several different, thematically unrelated objects at various locations on the table. I then focus my attention on one of the objects, and push it This causes the blanket to be tugged and, due to the folds, the other objects may *or may not* be shifted from their initial location. In one sense I might say that the act of pushing the object caused the change in other objects, but I will be unable to provide a reason or logical connection to link them together. If I deliberately shift an object, I can be certain of its new state *at the moment of shifting*. However, I cannot predict the effect of this on other objects, or the effect of future object movements on my present object.

The blanketed table in the metaphor is my own conscious space and world-pattern:

There is only an individual world really as far as my own access is concerned - a "private view". However when that world has properties identical with other "private views" then it is in effect in overlap with those views.

To try to be clearer: you live in your own copy of the world. The structure of your world dictates what other worlds you "share" with. You and I are overlapping because our world-patterns are currently aligned.

Cluster Nodes

> Perhaps there have always been two versions of Berenstein/stain coexisting in separate node clusters of the network. . . the Berenstain reality was chosen as the merged standard.

We could imagine that there are infinite "private views" with their own world-patterns. Views are in an "overlap state" when their world-patterns coincide, regardless of their history.

At present, all views in a "Beren**stain** state" are overlapping. Some views will have a "Beren**stein**" history, some a "Beren**stain**" history - but all that matters for overlap is that the current world-pattern state is "Beren**stain**".

For all practical purposes, then:

- You are a conscious being having a *person-in-a-world* experience and that is your "private view".
- Your world-pattern is always in a particular state.
- Your view *can* be considered to be in overlap with other views which are in the same state, regardless of their history.
- However, since both the content and overlap conditions are dictated by your own world-pattern, you can pretty much declare that you have your own world, and the Mandela Effect is a sign of shifts in your private world-pattern due to the impact of intention/observation.

TL;DR Summary

My attempt to corral this into something more readable:

- It's **not** like interconnected nodes exchanging information and modifying each other's state.
- It **is** like disconnected nodes which link and overlap to other nodes which have similar states.
- This is the same as just having a "private view", **except** that it means we all have access to the shame "raw patterning material" to make our worlds out of.

Reply to “[THEORY] The Brain is a Radio”

[[OP: Hello, fine people of Glitch In The Matrix! I've been stalking this sub for quite some time now. Almost two years already, in fact. One of my biggest frustrations so far is that there's no single simple unifying theory as to why all these glitches happen to all of us that satisfies me, aside from The Simulation Hypothesis. But the Simulation Hypothesis is boring, and takes on a very bleak view of the universe, and I prefer a different approach.

So I present to you my theory, for which I have yet found a suitable name. Instead, let me call this writeup **The Brain is a Radio**.

Intro

First, a little about me. I'm a software developer by profession. In college, my focus was Computer Science so I have a general understanding of how computer systems work. Specifically, the interesting part for which my theory draws a bit of inspiration is machine intelligence (or AI). In a nutshell, machine intelligence systems work by mimicking the human brain: that is, by creating a complex network of *neurons*. Neurons are basically just statistical machines, which rely on numbers and statistics to produce a certain output or decision. The AI decides *which action to take* by weighing the individual cost (or score) of a number of actions, and choosing one which yields a preferable outcome. Then, after the action is performed, the machine "learns" if the result was productive and adjusts the action's score (minus, if the the outcome was not favorable, or positive if the outcome was good). This process is called *machine learning*, and the system of neurons is called an *artificial neural network*. Interesting jargons. With me so far?

Alright, let's take this example: the AI is tasked to learn how to cross a busy intersection and is programmed to consider two things: first, the color of the stoplight, and second, if there are any incoming vehicles. Let's say that the perfect score (100) is when the light is green, and there are no crossing vehicles; mid-score (75) if the light isn't green but there are no vehicles, same score if there is a vehicle but the light is green; and lowest score (50) if the light isn't green and there are incoming vehicles. Obviously, the AI will pick the first case, which yields the best score. If, theoretically, the AI crosses the street given that condition AND suddenly gets hit by a vehicle which it didn't see during the decision-making, it would then lower the score for that choice to say, 90. Obviously, it will still pick this one next round, and so on, until it sees a better choice. Now why is this relevant and why is this interesting? Artificial neural networks are patterned after actual neurons, that is, the fundamental units of our brain. Scientists believe that the brain works on a similar process, choosing an action for every decision and evaluating a score based on its outcome. This is how the brain *experiences* things, and knows whether to do something or not. This is the same fundamental reason why you don't touch a hot object, because you know that it will hurt you -- your brain has given a low *score* for that action.

Classical View: "The Brain is a CPU"

Any good, self-respecting scientist or neurologist would tell you that we still don't understand how the brain *really* works. Sure, in the past decades we've been able to identify its basic parts and we have a firmer sense of how it *probably* works than ever before, but no one could tell you exactly how all the pieces fit together and what all the electrical signals that the brain produces mean and where they go, or how they get processed. But, it is colloquially agreed upon that the brain acts as the *central processing unit* of the body -- receiving sensory information, processing and storing, and then sending out appropriate nervous responses. It is also accepted

that the brain is responsible for regulating bodily functions and making sure that all the tiny bits and pieces work as they are expected, including things that you have no *conscious* control over (like your heartbeat, respiration, and digestion). For an even in-depth look at how we understand the brain to work, its wikipedia page is a good read.

Classical science tells us that the universe works on a fixed set of laws (of which the current most accepted one is the Standard Model), and everything that we ever experience in the universe manifests through a chain of much smaller physical phenomena. This perspective tells us that we are but mere observers of these physical phenomena, that things such as time and all other sensory experiences occur at a relatively constant rate and enter our brains based on a definite set of rules.

That said, why do these glitches *happen* and how do we *experience* them? After all, if the universe does work on a fixed immutable set of rules then it must be *100% certain* that everybody experiences everything in the exact same fashion; but logic *breaks* this assumption and disproves it because of all these reported glitches (and other weird "out-of-this-world" phenomena). This very sub (and its less active sibling) is a proof of that fact. And, more importantly, why do drugs, hallucinogens, and "brain damage" cause us to experience the world in a much more different manner? Sure, doctors will tell you that these things alter the way the brain works but they can't tell you *how so*: and this is because of the simple yet blinding fact that we don't really understand how the brain works. History tells us that all over the world, different cultures practice using different types of drugs to induce "supernatural" effects, with shamanic tribes using herbs to alter one's personality or even show images that are supposedly impossible to be seen. How do these things occur?

My Theory: "The Brain is a Radio"

I don't claim to be an expert in quantum physics or neurobiology, in fact, I only know as much about those topics as anyone in this sub. But I've read and experienced a lot of things and have seen numerous literature that have convinced me that we are all missing something that classical science can't explain and even modern physics has not yet accounted for. This theory poses a lot of *what if*s and relies on a lot of (currently) improvable assumptions, but if you give it five minutes and consider the possibilities, then you might possibly find yourself inclined to agree.

First, let's consider what quantum physics already tells us: there is an infinite number of universes out there, parallel to our own. However, our understanding of science forces us to accept that there is currently no conceivable way of accessing those alternate realities. For the purpose of this discussion, let's assume that our "alternate realities" are the Level 3 Parallel Universes detailed in the linked article.

Second, let's consider the fact that our brain has a part which has been baffling scientists for so long. Right now we understand that this part secretes hormones responsible for regulating our sleep cycle in humans and most mammals, but it also exists in some other non-mammalian species containing components resembling photoelectric detectors similar to those of the eye. Weird, considering that this part is buried deep within the brain. It's interesting then to note that countless other cultures and notable men of history (including Rene Descartes) believe that this very part is *the* third eye, and is responsible for making us see things we know we shouldn't be seeing. Enter the Pineal Gland: "principal seat of the soul". For centuries, different civilizations have erected structures shaped after the pine cone (or as some suggest, the pineal gland itself): the Angkor Wat in Cambodia for example, exhibit pine cone-shaped rooftops, the Roman Bronze Sculpture "Pigna" is (obviously) in the shape of a pine cone, and the staff of the Egyptian Pharaoh-god Osiris bears a pine cone. Of

course as with anything, take it with a grain of salt, but I'm sure you'll agree that the very fact that this symbol appears all over the world, is eerie.

Finally, let's try to marry those two points together. What if the brain, like a radio to a radio station, is actually just a receiver to a certain reality? And that everything that we collectively experience together in this realm is explained by the fact that our brains are tuned in to the same "frequency", if you will? If the pineal gland is actually the "antenna" or "TV aerial" of the brain, then that would explain why ancient civilizations have honored this part of the brain to be the key in unlocking the secrets of the universe and higher intelligence.

Here are some of the potential implications of that:

- Instead of thinking that drugs and other psychedelics *change* the way that our brains function, what if it causes the "tuning" of our brain to be offset to some other infinitesimally close frequency? That LSD, for example, does not cause us to "imagine things" but instead cause us to "see things outside our own reality."
- Glitches where people claim to have experienced an alternate reality may have unconsciously changed their brain's frequency due to stress or other physical condition. Distorted memories and "I've lived a different life" type experiences can then easily be attributed to the experiencer being in the wrong frequency.
- People "seeing" things that others can't see might be unconsciously experiencing things from other realities bleeding through, perhaps again, due to their tuning being changed.
- Essentially, if we can gain conscious control of how our brain are tuned, then we can gain access to any reality that we wish. A more direct interpretation of this is that it is possible to experience any reality at will. Bending the universe to your favor is merely changing the frequency that your brain is attuned to -- because, after all, if there is an infinite number of possibilities then anything *is* real. Passage of time; past, future, and present are but concepts of this current reality.

So far, we've only explored the possibilities of the brain being a one-way radio. But what about a two-way radio (or a walkie-talkie)? Our brains listening *and* broadcasting to a single frequency? If that's the case, then this will easily explain why some people claim to have telepathic experiences and why large groups of people seem to share a collective mind.

Some Final Thoughts

This theory may answer some questions unanswerable by classical science, but still fails to address one very important question: *what is consciousness*? Or even *what is and is there a soul*? If this is true -- that the brain is just a radio -- then is there any truth to ancient rituals and practices? That there are higher dimensions right within our grasp if only we can learn how to tune our brains to listen to the right frequencies?

Footnotes

Again, I am no expert, nor do I hold any paper for any special degree. Everything I've written is just the summary of an interpretation of the universe which I think might be possible. If you're asking me for any scientific basis, then we are misunderstanding each other. :)

If there's anything that I wasn't able to cover in my brief writeup, then feel free to ask me and I'll try my best to respond using the theory I've written. Let's discuss!]]

Excellent write-up.

The only problem is that the "brain" you hang this on is itself part of the experience being tuned into. If I tune into the experience of being an arctic explorer, and then into being a librarian, or the same librarian in a slightly different universe, each time going to see a doctor for an MRI, I'd get different results, since I'd be (apparently) in a different body. So...

Whatever it is that does the "tuning in" must itself be beyond that which is experienced, while still being an environment in which experiences are perceived...

Something which does not itself have qualities or structure or form, but which can "take on the shape of" these things...

In other words, if you were to swap "brain" for "consciousness" and say that what happens is:

- What you truly are is an "open space of consciousness", and
- This consciousness "tunes into" or "takes on the shape of" different experiences.

Then you'd be pretty much there. And even better, you can take this beyond mere theorising: you can fairly easily prove to yourself that your actual experience right now is like an "open space" in which sensations, perceptions and thoughts arise, simply by directly attending to it.

By flipping things around in this way ("the world appears within you"), the consciousness/soul problem immediately stops being an issue. Of course, the world itself now becomes essentially imaginary, distinguished from other thoughts by only its relative intensity and apparent stability.

[...]

To be clear, I do *not* think that reality is consciousness shaped within our brains. I'm saying that "consciousness" is the very stuff everything is made from. Brains are things we experience sometimes; they don't "cause" anything or shape anything.

Brains, Stations, Storage

> In addition to reality, I believe that there's another station at which the brain is attuned into: a station where the brain actually stores its data including memories, knowledge, and information.

Just to ask again: **where exactly *is* this brain?** It can't be the body-brains we see. It can't even be within space and time, surely?

On stations: You don't need this extra invention if you have consciousness being fundamental. All there is, is patterns that are "dissolved in" the space of consciousness. Your ongoing experience is then more akin to *recalling* those patterns in the same way as you recall a memory. You are *associatively exploring* the world in the same manner that you explore a strand of thought.

Since all possible experiences and information are available, things like past lives and others thoughts stop being a problem. It's all there, all the time. What you are calling a "tuning into a station" is just *remembering* - associatively triggering particular patterns such that they become brighter in consciousness, via "autocomplete". They are always there.

EDIT: In the same way as you can simultaneously experience the room you are "in" and also think about something, it would theoretically be possible to end up with two parallel experiences. This might lead to apparent mental health issues. Or maybe teleportation. ;-)

World As Imaginary

> This is because this essentially tells you that everything around you is a product of your own consciousness, an effect of your own thinking.

The assumption you are making here is that it is "your" consciousness. Actually, consciousness is impersonal and it just happens to be having the experience of "thinking about being frankz0509 in a world".

> Which means that since everything is real within your consciousness, nothing is.

This is essentially the position of many traditions - but again, with the change that it is not "your" consciousness. Nothing "is" in the sense that there is no external, inaccessible world that somehow "causes" our experiences.

You are consciousness "taking on the shape of" frankz0509-in-the-world-in-this-situation.

You As Imaginary

> Essentially, you are alone in the universe and everything around you is imaginary.

And you are imaginary too! ;-)

This isn't a problem really. Saying that "everything is consciousness taking on the form of experience" is no different to saying that "everything is made from atoms and brains". In fact, the former allows you to have agency and intelligence (awareness, intention, free will) whereas the latter doesn't.

EDIT: You are alone in the universe in the sense that you have your own "private view" experience, however you are not alone because you are intimately connected with all possible experience, and during your experiences you *are* the entire universe (effectively). The "world-sharing model" for this isn't simple to describe, because inherently it is not formatted in terms to time and space (which are aspects of *experiencing* and are not fundamental outside of that).

We need to be careful with the word "imaginary". It's come to be interpreted as "unimportant" or "without meaning" but really it says the opposite: everything is fundamentally *meaningful*. The meaning of things is actually more primary than the shape, colour, texture, etc! What we actually end up with is that instead of being alone, the experience of "being you" and everything else is intimately connected, part of one undivided conscious "material" which is "taking on the shape of" different experiences...

Direct Exploration

For this approach, you really need to go back to your actual experience without any preconceptions - e.g. George Berkeley and his *Three Dialogues* or in more modern times: Rupert Spira's direct attending or Douglas Harding's funny little experiments.

Conscious experience becomes primary. It always is, of course, it's just that we've got in the habit of imagining it isn't, starting with a fictional picture of us being "in the world" and proceeding from there. We don't lose any of our scientific discoveries and so on by disgarding this, but we do end up with a reorientation of what it means to "make observations".

This switch-around is, I think, what most historical traditions are pointing at. Even things like the Biblical parables make better sense when re-interpretated as descriptions of our true relationship to experience.

TL;DR: There is no "solid underlying" to the world; experiencing is like recalling memories; imaginary == meaningful.

> [Q: Blew my mind here. Seriously awesome post. Berkeley is a good recommendation, for sure! If you're unfamiliar with Eastern philosophy, I'd also recommend some of the philosophers from Advaita Vedanta, who have been positing ideas quite similar to this for a long, long time (though somewhat in reverse from an epistemological perspective - rather than a field of consciousness experiencing itself in various discrete beings and events, they talk about the perspective of one of these particular beings trying to remember that it IS that field of consciousness!)]

Cheers! Yes, I've delved into that side too. The same story has been retold and updated forever, it seems! And I agree with that "way round" actually, or more specifically I think they are the same thing: A conscious field shapes itself into the experience of "being a person in a world", forgets its true nature, spends a lot of time wandering around space rediscovering it is not a person but a field of consciousness - and that there is no time and space. :-)

[...]

> > Is it possible for consciousness to be hacked into...

Not sure I follow you. All experience occurs within consciousness; there is no outside. It's all arising as sensory experience within this "perceptual space". In lucid dreaming, you can have a dream about taking drugs and having all sorts of corresponding experiences. Where are the "drugs" and the "brain" in this case? What is difference between the waking version and the dreaming version of that situation?

> > What would be the purpose of consciousness observing itself other than to create a fictitious or faulty experience.

What purpose does there have to be? Simply enjoyment and curiosity, which is what drives most of your life (except for fear, or course). "Fictitious" and "faulty" relative to what? If there's no "outside" to experience, then there's nothing to compare it to. It's like saying something that happens on Planet Earth is "faulty". Relative to what? Relative only to a preconceived *idea* we might have *about* it.

[...]

> > > OP: In accordance to the multiverse theory, what I'm trying to propose is that the brain is tuned to a specific frequency or *reality* (universe). I still haven't found where the consciousness actually fits into, but that's also a good idea to explore: that the consciousness itself *is* the radio station. What I mean by the brain being tuned to this universe:
>
> > > Since there is an infinite number of universes out there, us being in this universe is merely the effect of our brains being set to listen to this universe. If for example, one day I suddenly experience seeing things that are not supposed to be; or I remember memories I have no recollection of having, then I'm suggesting that perhaps my brain has somehow been bumped into a different frequency.
>
> > > I'd like to believe than more than just the universe, the brain is also connected to a vastly invisible field that connects all humans and that perhaps this is where all our memories and data is stored

> Q: Right, but if it's the brain tuning into the universe, which universe is the brain located in?

Bingo.

> OP: The brain -- the physical mass attached to body -- is attached to whatever university it is in. However the mind, or the ethereal chunk of consciousness that exists outside space-time, isn't located anywhere and is everywhere at the same time. Think of it this way: you have 1,000 radios each tuned to their own frequencies. Each radio station plays only the songs of a certain artist. Now you, the person listening, has the choice of moving around and going near whatever radio you want to listen to. All's well and good, right? Now, say I tweak one radio (re-tune it) so that it listens to a different radio station instead, and it all goes chaotic because it's not meant to listen to that frequency. You, the person in this picture = mind; radio = brain; radio station = universe. Seems pretty clear to me.

Right! I see where we differ. So to clarify, you are saying:

- person = mind = listener
- brain = radio
- universe = station

I'm suggesting the "brain=radio" bit isn't required, that it's an extra step which exists only for the analogy and can never actually be observed. We never actually experience having a brain that tunes into things. The *having-a-brain* thing would be part of the experience of a universe, not an intermediary.

What we are left with is:

- person = mind = consciousness (an open aware space)
- consciousness "tunes into" particular experiences (forming itself into a "dream perspective")[1]

Skipping the intermediate step, this matches with our direct experience (a conscious "space" which seems to "take on the shape" of the experience of *being-a-person-in-a-world*). The urge we have to fill the gap between the two steps perhaps comes from wanting to imagine a mechanism by which consciousness/mind "connects to" a universe - but that's not needed. After all, outside of experiencing it, there is no time of space, and so no mechanism or connection or material by which such a thing could be formed. The mind being unbounded and unlocated, it's actually the other way around: all possible experiences are "dissolved into" consciousness itself. All time and space is available now. Selecting an experience/universe is akin to "remembering" or "intensifying" an image from a holographic space. (A bit like an 'Imagination Room'.) What a person is, *is* that holographic space.

[1] The "dream perspective" is always a *1st-person* perspective, consisting of sensations, perceptions and thoughts. It cannot be accurately represented using a 3rd-person perspective model; it has no "outside".

Reply to “[THEORY] Instructions in pi at c (299792458) points to a hidden message in phi.”

Messages aren't *left* by God or a simulation creator or whatever. Messages from randomness are instead *discerned* by the reader - i.e. you are the process by which order and meaning is extracted from experience. You are both the writer and the reader of these messages, simultaneously, but because the process is transparent, it always seems as if the message is coming from "out there".

Be warned: the pattern-selection process of synchronicity will lead you into a crazy spiral if you let it.

The world *is* intelligently designed in a way - but it's more accurate to say it is *intelligently interpreted*. **You are literally experiencing your own intelligence at work, forming an ordered world out of the "infinite gloop" that is the true reality, and then incorrectly attributing that intelligence to another being**.

[...]

Well, the *Library of Babel* (that site is based on the story by Jorge Luis Borges) is really saying that a library which contains an infinite number of books containing random patterns will *apparently* contain all possible knowledge. However, it is the *reader* who makes sense of the patterns.

In other words, the books themselves contain no knowledge; the knowledge is in the meaning discerned by the reader. So it is really contrary to OP's message:

- OP is saying that he has identified meaningful patterns in the world, and that those meaningful patterns are an indication of an intelligence "outside" which has created the world.
- The *Library of Babel* says that the world itself is a random sequence, and that it is OP *himself* whose intelligence discerns meaningful patterns in it. ***OP is the creator of meaning; it is not in the world.***

Yeah, I'm not sure how English became "The Language"! Borges was French though, which adds an extra twist to this.

[...]

Well now...

Who wants a "standard" model when we can invent a "super-duper" model instead? ;-)

We avoid the solipsism by realising there is no division beyond the experiencing of division; consciousness is "before" time and space. It can't really be talked about because language presumes division and relation, but worlds are private, in effect. Science starts at the observation; only creates descriptions for what has been observed. It cannot talk about how a particular thing came to be observed vs another. And *all* observations are subjective experiences! Might that "medium" be consciousness/awareness itself? Of course, that means at the fundamental level you have to throw away the idea of the world as a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time" and replace it with dimensionless patterns... but above that you can use any pseudo-continuous concept. Put me on the list for a hover board! :-)

Reply to “[THEORY] Theory of everything”

Some thoughts on solipsism- Yeah, it's definitely solipsism in the broader sense, in that all that can be directly known is "your mind" (avoiding the word "self" here, which has become muddled in use). But that doesn't necessarily mean we're talking about a *personal* mind, one that belongs to a person, because "being a person" is something you have an experience *of*, it's not something you *are*.

It's saying that all you can ever know fundamentally is:

- That you exist.
- That you are having experiences.

And really these are the same thing: that "you are experiencing". Any thoughts you have *about* experiencing, are also experiences. There is no "outside" to experiencing. It is *meaningless* to talk about what you "are", other than that you are *that-which-has-experiences*. However, beyond this fundamental truth (the *nature* of experiencing, the *context*), which cannot be conceptualised and so there's not much to say about it, we *can* talk about relative truth (the *shape* of experiences, the *content*) and the conceptual frameworks we construct in parallel to describe them. We can investigate the content and make up stories about it, but those are all "connective fictions". And with a (semi-)solipsistic view at the context, we won't be in danger of confusing our descriptions for the actual context. This is recognising the error in assuming we can have an experience *about* the structure of experiences. Even the concept of it having a "structure" is incorrect, because structure is an experience, and whatever it is, is "before" that. It's like trying to make a sandcastle which accurately models "sand" (or more accurately perhaps: that tries to model the colour "sand-yellow"). You can *be* sand, taking on different shapes of sandcastle, but you cannot take on the shape of sand. You can *be* sand-yellow but you cannot take on the shape of that colour. This immediately dispenses with the 'simulation' hypothesis, the 'objective world', and all other notions of an external solid substrate that arranged in space that underpins experiencing, as anything more than fun "what if?" ideas that can never be proven. Although there might be an extent to which experiences might be have "as if" such things were true, the things themselves can never be examined, as contexts.

But what about "everything depends on your beliefs"? -

Well, there is no inherent structural reason why this couldn't be the case - the bunch of models or narratives we have are just our own fictions, they are *descriptive* rather than *causal*, they arise from a small subset of our observations-to-date, and do not really forbid anything. The only way you could know for sure is to adopt different beliefs and see how that affected the content of your subsequent experiences. Perform experiments.

Having said that, it would seem like a good idea to have some sort of definition for what a "belief" is. Is it "thinking that something is true"? We are surely talking about something more than an opinion here. The literal formatting of one's mind by a "fact-pattern"? Could there be such a thing as "intensity" of belief or an "adopted fact"? How would one adjust the intensity of such a pattern, and explore its effects, if any?

[...]

Perhaps the problem amounts to: how can you confirm the nature of experiencing? And the answer is pretty much: you cannot. Or at least, not in the positive, not by performing an act.

So initially anyway, this is a *negative* description of experience. It suggests what is *not* true - by which I mean not *fundamentally* true - and it highlights what is *meaningless* to pursue. What it does do, is provide you with a boundary-free way of conceiving of experience. It says: there is no "how it is really" at all in terms of content. From there, though, we can push forward...

Recapping, we have something like this from a subjective perspective:

- What you truly seem to be is an "open aware space" in which experiences arise. (This is directly knowable.)
- All possible fact-patterns are "dissolved" into this space. (Metaphor.)
- The relative "intensities" of these fact-patterns correspond to the static state of *you-and-the-world*. (The current "list of active facts".)
- Your ongoing sensory ("the world") and shadow-sensory ("thought") experiences arise from that current state. (To modify the state would be to modify the experience.)

The way to confirm this setup would be:

- To satisfy yourself by direct observation that you are an in fact an "open aware space".
- To deliberately change state and observe that the subsequent content of experience corresponds to that modified state.

The first, I suggest, is easily done. The second requires a bit more pondering. So, how do we change state? *Can* we change state? If we were follow up OP's ideas, then our first port of call would surely be to identify how "beliefs" fit into this model, how they are related to "facts", and how exactly we might modify beliefs to see if it results in observable changes in experience. (Additional concept we might choose to introduce along the way: **intention**.)

[...]

> [Q: So, some interesting observations:
>
> 1) When I am in a bad mood, it colors how I see everyone else behaving around me. They become more sinister, more reflecting of my mood. This is evidence that belief can effect perception.
>
> 2) When LDing, it can become easier to confuse reality and dreams in small instances. Dream verification checks can counter this, but the feeling of living the dream re-enforces the idea that life may be like a dream. One of these individuals may truly believe they can fly like they do in their dreams (much like some drug users may believe they can fly). However, they are not observed to fly in the physical reality, and confrontation has shown they will readily admit they can't fly, but believed they could.
>
> This seems to counter the idea that belief changes physical reality, but not the idea that belief colors perception of reality.]

They could both be a reflection of the (potential) fact that your belief changes reality.

First, let us consider that "reality" is a concept - by which I mean, the notion that there is a "baseline" and that your perceptions are a modification or filter of that (even though you will never experience the baseline).

What we are talking about here, is depth of change. Our general assumption is that "reality" is pretty much world-shaped, and that perception is a small adjustment of this. What if "reality" was of no shape at all, basically an "infinite gloop", and that perception was the entirety of the selection or shaping component? This leads us to...

Returning to our idea of the "relative intensities of facts", in your dream the relative intensities are close to each other. The highs and the lows are not very far apart, and hence easily adjusted. Turning no-fly into yes-fly is a minimal adjustment from peak to trough. Meanwhile, in waking life the peak-to-trough is much greater - facts are "more intense" - so a much greater adjustment of the intensity of no-fly is needed. A simple decision or an "I can fly!" thought makes minimal difference. However, fact-patterns that are more shallow and whose alteration is less world-breaking are much more susceptible: your bad mood and the "everyone is evil" thought is hardly a change at all, and is easilywithin the fuzzy adjustability zone of "plausibility".

For the sake of argument, if we say *thoughts* are basically "intensifying a fact-pattern" and *intentions* are a type of thought consisting of strong "assertions of fact", then the extent to which our experience will be modified will depend upon how much our state is shifted relatively speaking, which in turn depends on how intense the fact or counter-fact already is.

> [Q: So then we should be able to measure these peak to trough sizes for a variety of situations for a quantity of people. Perhaps using hypnotism? What we are really measuring, then, is the discrepancy between physical and mental, or how much mental influences physical. In my first scenario, mental is only influencing mental.
>
> If I build an airplane, physical is influencing physical directly, and mental is influencing the ordering of the physical (another non-physical trait, since that organization is only assumed organized by the mind). What we want is for the mental to directly influence the physical. We have a map where we think the mental is represented in the physical (the mind holds the mental, or at least translates it into the physical and the physical into mental). Perhaps there is something in our bodies we can examine to discover the separation and connection between physical and mental? If we know their differences, we can probably also find how they effect each other, and how to improve or hinder that effect to accomplish something.]

One of the issues with that approach, is that the model says that the mental/physical division is not meaningful. They are both just experiences arising *inside* the "open perceptual space", which itself has no outside. One might say that the experience of the physical world is like a particularly bright *strand of thought*, one that is quite 3D-expansive and unusually stable - but it still occupies the same space as any other thought you have. Mental and physical differ only in stability, brightness and 3D-immersiveness - not in *kind*.

So we can't really measure the "intensity of facts" objectively, because the notion of "objective" isn't meaningful here. And if we hypnotise other people, for example, what we are doing is creating an "experience of hypnotising someone" within our own experience - which of course is shaped by our own beliefs. No matter what we do, we are in effect dreaming. Any action-based experiments you perform within a dream-world on a dream-world, are dream-experiments, and yield dream-results. We might think of ourselves as the "dream space" here.

But what we *can* do is experiment with ourselves. Not via actions perhaps, because all our action-experiences will arise from the current state, and will be consistent with it, when what we are trying to do is *change* that state. Could we instead proceed via intentions...?

> [Q: This is ignoring the observational evidence of a separation between mental and physical. Though the theory claims there is no real division aside from intensity, physical reality shows some sort of division. Whether that division is merely the difference between a system that watches 5 Volt fluctuations versus 500 Volt fluctuations (just an example of a system type that can depend on fluctuations of intensity), we still need to discover what the mechanism of that separation is. Once we know HOW these two observable levels of interaction are separated, then we can learn the mechanism to span that separation. The division of mental / physical is meaningful because it is observable, not because it is an accurate representation of the underlying forces. We are trying to discover the underlying forces, but we only have the observable to work from, so we use what we have.]

I'm not so sure about this. What exactly is the observational evidence of a separation between mental and physical? Can you expand on that?

> [Q: Imagine a house. How big is it? No matter the size, how much space did it take up in physical reality? It didn't take up any perceivable space, therefore it must not have been a physical creation (for this physical reality, anyway). Next, try to move an object with your mind. Imagine it moving, or do any number of things you can think of to move the object using your thoughts. If the thoughts don't have a physical component (you spoke to someone, you moved your body, you used a special device that monitors electrical impulses in your brain to move a robotic arm), it seems, at this juncture, that you cannot move the object. That is the visible separation we see. The mental can create vast images and experiences, but they don't last, and often have poor resolution and/or dissolve when examined or ignored. They also take up no physical space (from what we can tell). The physical can move things and mimic things, but doesn't seem to be able to produce spontaneously (like visualization), though it is quite resilient to observation, scrutiny, and being ignored.]

So, we're distinguishing between the two based on apparent properties, not necessarily by nature (since both appear in the same perceptual space, even if apparently in different "parallel-simultaneous" places sometimes).

If we return to the idea of different *strands of thought* arising in the same space, with one (which we label "physical reality") being more persistent and intense than others (the other thoughts we have) - would we necessarily expect a "parallel" strand of thought to affect the main one?

When I move my arm, do I not "intend" its motion? Is that not the same as modifying the main strand of thought, by basically thinking the "arm movement" pattern into that strand? If I just think *about* moving my arm, it doesn't have the same effect, because the thought *about* it is in a separate strand.

Meanwhile, does a "physical" house really take up any space? How much space is the room next to this one occupying right now? Is it not the case that spatial extent is *part of an experience*, and that we just *assume* that the rest of the world is laid out in space in the same way as our experiences are formatted?

Looping this back to belief: Is the problem with effecting large changes perhaps due to a mix of: a) the relative intensity problem noted earlier, and: b) that we often don't "think-intend" into the stand of thought we are wanting to change, and instead we start a new strand *about* the change.

> [Q: We distinguish between apparent properties because they are measurable (though I'm sure we can build a measurement for not so apparent properties once we develop consistency in our tests). Are we assuming they are different states of the same substance (like solid/liquid/gas)? Or that they are perpendicular (not obviously interacting?) properties (like color/size/weight)? We assume the room takes up space because it is consistently using that observed space each time we check on it (barring unusual circumstances). It is the consistency of the physical form which is very enduring, versus the consistency of the mental form, which fades quickly. Thinking ABOUT doing, rather than thinking that IS doing, is another conundrum we will need to decipher if we want to unlock the differences between the perceived mental and perceived physical. How do you "think-intend" an object to move, rather than just think about it moving? What can we do to focus on, or expand, our awareness of the difference between the two, experientially (rather than just through mental models)
>
> Yes, this could be an issue needing both intensity and properly placed intention. Can we devise a test that can divide the two? A test where the level of intensity can be measured without worrying about the intent? Or where the intent direction can be measured at an intensity that we find natural or easy?]

Okay, for the first part - Let us reintroduce that old standard: lucid dreams.

When lucid dreaming, although often lucid dreams are vague and unstable, it is actually possible to apparently create or go to a pre-existing (via creation by implication) environment that is stable and persists and can be revisited. In all respects, it is another "physical world" and is recognised as a dream perhaps because when there I have memories of being here, but when here I do not have memories of an experience which precedes this one.

Going with this, then we have a set of experiences which are all of the same "kind", but differ in stability: *thought -> dream -> lucid dream -> persistent realm -> physical reality*, with the last two being fairly indistinguishable except in terms of their content in context.

It seems that the difference is *only* in stability. Therefore we might ask, what is it that makes one stand of experience more stable than another? Is it just that relative intensity thing, the amplitude of facts?

Intending change in the "physical" strand -

> > How do you "think-intend" an object to move, rather than just think about it moving?

How does the dream intention differ from the physical intention?

There are two ways one does this in a dream: one directly "asserts the fact" of the movement, or one asserts an intermediary. It tends to be much easier to do the latter - for example, to "reach out" with one's feeling and grab it (avoiding here the more extravagant imaginings). However, since the whole dream *is* us, they are really equivalent, and I am just misdirecting myself from noticing I am actually still asserting directly - the "reach out" - because my assertion *logically implies* my result and makes it seem reasonable.

In both those cases, I am intending *as* the dream rather than creating a separate thought bubble, as it were. In waking life, the default would be to consider the body-space as "you" and the rest of experience as "other". Is the first step to identify with the whole experience, and so take it on as one's "extended body"?

The problem here is that there can be no "how" to do this, you just have to become it. But the intermediary approach in the dream scenario gives us a hint: expanding our "feeling-presence" to fill out the (apparent) room, and beyond. The further we try to describe this, the vaguer and more abstract it becomes again, it seems.

> Yes, this could be an issue needing both intensity and properly placed intention. Can we devise a test that can divide the two? A test where the level of intensity can be measured without worrying about the intent?

A first step might be to not try and alter any *facts*, but simply to recognise ourselves fully as the background of this strand of experience - fully assert that we are the "open aware perceptual space" in which experiences arise. This would be like a "null intention": no changing of facts but an establishing of context.

> I do think an attempt at a "null intention" that is open and receptive is great for observation. But I think manipulation is what we are trying to achieve.

We might think of it as an initial "disentangling" of ourselves (or identification) from the content of experience, redefining our relationship to it into something clearer and cleaner, and in some ways allowing it to "settle" because we are no longer thrashing it.

> So first we attempt to build a receptive, null state. When we get good at that, then we attempt to assert our intention upon part of what we receive?

Right. Now, we are *always* the entirety of the space and what arises within it, but having reshaped experience to be basically "I am the container + the content arises within me", the assertion would be more straightforward. A further step would be to release the division between container and content and just identify with the entirety, but that shouldn't be necessary if one already recognises the truth of the situation. Also, if you do that you'll probably lose interest in changing anything!

So the general idea: first use assertion to reshape ourselves into an arrangement which promotes non-attachment to unfolding content, and then utilise that because this better allows subsequent assertions of fact.

> so what am I doing wrong?

I suppose that would depend on what exactly you are doing! :-)

For the sake of argument: if everything is part of a single landscape, then your ear and its condition is part of an extended pattern, and its blockage will be part of a larger structure. So the question becomes: how to get access this structure and allow it to shift? Which thoughts and/or physical elements are in play here, what is dominating?

Well, the nice thing about a continuous pattern is that there is no particular starting point as such. Rather than sloshing about looking for the thing which triggers it and work towards the problem, you could go to the "ear blockage" part of the pattern and work your way out.

How exactly would one do this? Well, just rest your attention lightly on the sensory aspect of the pattern (the feeling of your ear being blocked, located in your perceptual space) and sit with it, and mentally *ask or intend* to know what the extended pattern is of which the blockage is a part. I mean this literally.

There's not much point asking what things "are" - because the answer is: they "are" your experience of them, which is itself made from your awareness of it. You blockage might be said to be: the perceptual experience of having a blockage *plus* all its associations. If you "sit with it", with your attention on your ear and the sense of blockage or absence of sound there, you will likely after a while start having associations arise with it, as additional sensory experience or thoughts and impressions.

> [Q: if all the associations with the blockages are to compel me to not remain in duality then the discomfort remains
>
> focusing on the problem leads to the recognition of the entirety of the duality
>
> the experience I want to have is the realisation that the control of the blockage is mine and then it will unblock
>
> so the only way to overcome it is to overcome it
>
> edit: and I can say with certainty that mushrooms enable me to relieve pressure, stiffness and blockages]

You're overthinking this.

'If you "sit with it", with your attention on your ear and the sense of blockage or absence of sound there, you will likely after a while start having associations arise with it, as additional sensory experience or thoughts and impressions.'; Yep - attending to, not thinking about or manipulation of. That's my practical advice. (Within the context of this discussion, that is.)

[...]

So, probably you should define what you mean by "reality" here? You seem to be separating out what is "in mind" and what is "in reality", somehow?

Suggestion: Reality is an eternal landscape whose contours are adjusted by intention.

I'd suggest that context is the difference.

So, if I simply think "mushroom" (but non-verbally), then I am intensifying the unbounded extended pattern of "mushroom" and it will contribute more to my ongoing experience from that point onwards. If I narrow this with spatial, temporal, additional context, then that activation becomes more specific.

The landscape should be conceived of as "all possible fact-patterns as a distribution of relative intensities, hence at different levels of contribution to ongoing experience", which is "dissolved into the background" of the open aware perceptual space that you are.

Note that pre-existing patterns would be things like "spatial extent is a thing" and "temporal arrangement is a thing" and "time passing is a thing". Basically, if you can understand it, if you can think it at all, then it pre-exists and its level of contribution is adjustable.

Passing thoughts are just part of the current landscape. Intentional thoughts are deformations of that landscape; intensifications of that pattern. You are literally reshaping *yourself-as-the-world* when you deliberately think. . However, there is a further consideration: whether when thinking you are thinking in a separate "strand of thought" or in the same stand as the main 3D-immersive experience strand.

Meanwhile, emphasising: there is only The Now, even though certain experience may seem to be "about" the past, the future, the present.

[...]

> [Q: The placebo effect is exactly our beliefs in action. Of course this is something different than 'everything *depending* on beliefs'. For a fact it is showing the causal powers of belief. Similar influence on our biological system have been shown during meditation. We now commonly accept these things as falling within the realm of neuroplasticity, in order to have a place for it within current paradigm.
>
> Despite this being a commonly accepted fact. We know jack-shit about it and there has been very little research into this direction. Mostly because there is no funding for it, not because of lack of interest. The research direction of psychokinesis (because that is basically what this is) falls outside current paradigms and is met with great hostility by self-proclaimed 'skeptics' and the ideology of 'scientism'.]

Agreed on the placebo effect. That's one of the reasons why I think there's maybe a better word than "belief", though, since believing (in the sense of having a committed conscious view that something is the case) is not necessarily required for a placebo response. However, a certain sort of "patterning of mind" might be.

Again, when it comes to research we hit the problem that although "observations dictate the possible models; models do not dictate the possible observations", we behave as though to stray beyond the vague outline of our current concepts is indeed forbidden and non-scientific. In recent times (probably post-WW2) our default view is that the world is now basically understood and is not mysterious to us - it's just a case of detailing it out. This, even though our models are completely lacking in explanatory power for most things, especially when it comes to the brain and consciousness. Vague 'placeholder' ideas or conceptual containers are *not* explanations, quite apart from being restrictions, but we behave as though they are, and that they define boundaries beyond which things are not "real". (Irony: declaring things to be unreal based on conclusions drawn from narrative fictions.)

I've read Bernardo's stuff and he's a good writer, but I'm not *quite* in alignment with it, perhaps because his metaphors stray towards trying to present things as objective-but-really-subjective, even though he himself doesn't entirely hold that view, it seems to be. I think some of that comes from a fear of advocating solipsism in any form, and also to keep things professionally presentable (both are fair enough). I suppose I'm proposing something that is a blend of philosophical idealism and non-dualism: staying pinned to direct experience, plus a baseline metaphor of "patterning" which allows conceptualising, but in the most flexible way, and in a way that could not be confused for being "how it is really".

[...]

> Its not possible for everything to be dependent on beliefs because people's beliefs contradict each other all the time.

This does assume that we live in a "simply shared" world, though, that we are all sharing the same space and are located within it.. This isn't necessarily the case.

Our assumption that the world is of the same layout as our experience (as in: "spatially-extended and unfolding in time"), is just that: an assumption. It may be that the world is more like a "logical space", and our individual perceptual experiences don't overlap in a straightforward way. The world may be more like a *resource* than a place - a toy box of potential experiential patterns, from which we select our own list of facts.

Of course, there's no way to prove that one way or the other - but it's worth us noting that the same applies to much of the default view of our experiences too. The idea that space and time are aspects of the structure of experience, rather than the structure of the world, does at least provide wiggle room when it comes to accounting for more unusual personal observations (like in this sub), and perhaps exploring the relationship between perception and world. How deep and foundational does the perceptual selection process go?

Recently, Marcus Arvan's *P2P Hypothesis* and Christopher Fuch's *QBism Interpretation* have both pushed towards something like this "private view" approach to experience - that we each have a personal slice (or list of facts) from the "infinite gloop" (reservoir of all possible facts).

Reply to “[THEORY] Non Player Characters”

Are we perhaps all in our own "private views" of the world, our own instance of an ongoing present moment, with only partial overlap with other people? This would be like being the whole dream of your life, including fictitious characters, but now and again your "conscious perceptual space" would become entangled with other "conscious spaces" (although probably not in a direct way; more like a sharing of patterns).It might be impossible to tell though, whether this was happening. It would likely be a preference as to how you want to think of things.

Related:

> ‘That there is a place for the present moment in physics becomes obvious when I take my experience of it as the reality it clearly is to me and recognize that space-time is an abstraction that I construct to organize such experiences. At any moment I can represent my past experience as my world-line, terminating in my Now. As it turns into a memory, I expand my diagram to contain my subsequent Nows. The motion of my Now along my world-line reflects the fact that as my watch advances I acquire more experiences to record.
>
> This provides the place in physics for the Now of any one person. But could the problem of the Now lie in relating the present moments of several different people? When you and I are communicating face-to-face I cannot imagine that a live encounter for me could be only a memory for you, or vice versa. When two people are together at an event, if the event is Now for one of them, then it is Now for both. Although this is only an inference for each person, I take it to be as fundamental a feature of two perceiving subjects as the Now is for a single subject.
>
> Our present moments must overlap at every one of our meetings — whenever we have a conversation, move apart and then come back together and have another conversation. But throughout human history people have only moved at low speeds. The complicating effect of relativistic 'time dilation' — the slowing down of rapidly moving clocks — on the advances of our different individual Nows has been far too small to notice. We can, however, entertain the question of whether our present moments would coincide when we came back together, regardless of how rapidly we moved back and forth and regardless of how long the journey.’
>
> -- *QBism puts the scientist back into science*, N David Mermin, *Nature*, 26 March 2014

The debate here would be whether an *apparently* live encounter with "someone else" is really actually a memory, a pre-existing pattern recalled into our experience on demand, also made from you with, nothing behind it other than you. (Mermin's reasoning against this amounts to: "I don't like the idea so I choose to imagine it's actually a live overlap", which isn't really much of an argument.)

If this was the case, then *all* characters would be NPCs in a sense - including you, because you'd just be an experiential pattern too (sensations, perceptions). However, "the player" would be the whole perceptual space, the whole dream environment and everyone in it, so in another sense everyone would be "the player". What you would really be, would be that player and that whole environment, but having an experience of *being-a-person-in-a-world*.

TL;DR: Our worlds might overlap with other conscious people/beings, but we wouldn't really be able to tell one way or the other anyway. There result is that everyone is an NPC, including you, but also everyone is The Player, including you.

[...]

> Q1: This sounds like budding Narcissistic Personality Disorder. Careful, there.

I think it's just a natural part of questioning your world. Everyone goes through these thoughts at some time. "Is everyone else a real person too?"

The answer of course, is that *you* aren't a "person" either, but neither are you a simulation.

> Q2: Classic fear response. Don't feed fear, dont plant dirty seeds, plant seeds in dirt.

Well, labels are a bad thing - which is why I put "person" in quotes. For sure, it's an uncomfortable experience to be labeled by others, but to label *yourself* as something, to identify yourself with a concept, even it if it apparently innocuous (e.g. "person"), is probably much worse.

EDIT: Ah, you've edited your comment since I replied to it. Originally it was talking about labelling people and not being a "Negative Personality Concept" by planting "dirty" seeds of thought. I'll leave my reply as it is.

Reply to “[THEORY] One of my favourite short stories”

[[‘**I don't know, Timmy, being God is a big responsibility**’ by qntm

Tim already had his bag and overcoat on and his keys in his hand and was about to leave when Diane stopped him at the door.

"I just got this thing working. You have to come and see it."

"I have a bus to catch."

"You can get the next one."

"They're every half an hour," he objected. "This had better be good."

"It's super-duper. Look at the big screen, it's easier than squinting at my terminal."

"Will this take long?"

"A mere instant. Okay, quantum computing, right?"

"That's the name of the game," he replied. They - by which we now refer to Tim, Diane, their eight colleagues, their two supervisors, four chemical engineers, six electrical engineers, the janitor, a countable infinity of TEEO 9.9.1 ultra-medium-density selectably-foaming non-elasticised quantum waveform frequency rate range collapse selectors and the single tormented tau neutrino caught in the middle of it all - represented the sum total of the human race's achievements in the field of quantum computing. Specifically, they had, earlier that week, successfully built a quantum computer. Putting into practice principles it had taken a trio of appallingly intelligent mathematical statisticians some 10 years to mastermind, and which only about fifty-five other people in the world had yet got a grip on, they had constructed an engine capable of passing information to and processing the responses from what could, without hyperbole, be described as a single fundamental particle with infinite processing power and infinite storage capacity.

Not quite enough time had yet passed for the world as they knew it to be totally and permanently fundamentally altered by this news.

But it was still pretty exciting stuff. Holy *Zarquon*, they said to one another, an *infinitely powerful computer*? It was like a thousand Christmases rolled into one. Program going to loop forever? You knew for a fact: this thing could execute an infinite loop in less than ten seconds. Brute force primality testing of every single integer in existence? Easy. Pi to the last digit? Piece of cake. Halting Problem? Sa-*holved*.

They hadn't announced it yet. They'd been programming. *Obviously* they hadn't built it just to see if they could. They had had plans. In some cases they had even had code ready and waiting to be executed. One such program was Diane's. It was a universe simulator. She had started out with a simulated Big Bang and run the thing forwards in time by approximately 13.6 billion years, to approximately just before the present day, watching the universe develop at every stage - taking brief notes, but knowing full well there would be plenty of time to run it again later, and mostly just admiring the miracle of creation.

Then, just this Friday, she had suddenly started programming busily again. And it was sheer coincidence that it was just now, just as Tim was about to be the second-to-last person to step out of the door and go home for the weekend, that her work had come to fruition. "Look what I found," she said, pressing some keys. One of the first things she had written was a software viewing port to take observations from the simulated universe.

Tim looked, and saw a blue-white sphere in the blackness, illuminated from one side by a brilliant yellow glare. "You've got to be joking. How long did that take to find? In the entire cosmos of what, ten to the twenty-two stars?"

"Literally no time at all."

"Yes, yes, of course."

"Coding a search routine and figuring out what to search for was what took the time."

"Is it definitely Earth?"

"Yes. The continents match up to what we had about three hundred and fifty million years ago. I can wind the clock forwards slowly, a few million years per step, and stop it once we start getting near the present day."

"Can you wind the clock backwards at all?"

"Ah, no. Ask me again on Monday."

"Well we'd better not overshoot the present day, then. That's getting closer. What about this viewpoint? Can we move it?"

"We can observe the simulation from any angle you like."

"We need somewhere that we know civilisation is going to arise earliest. Somewhere easy to locate. Is there a Nile Delta yet?"

"...Yes. Got it."

They advanced a thousand years at a time until Egyptian civilisation begin to appear. Diane moved the viewing port, trying to find the pyramids, but with little success - the control system she had devised was clumsy and needed polish, and there was a lot of Nile to search. In the end she switched focus to the British Isles, and found the future location of London in the Thames valley, scaling back to one-century steps and using the development of the city to determine the current era instead.

"So... this is Earth? I mean, is this really Earth? Not an alternate Earth, subtly perturbed by random fluctuations."

"The simulation starts with a Big Bang as predicted by current theory and is recalculated once every Planck time using the usual laws of nature and an arbitrary degree of accuracy. It doesn't calculate the whole universe at once, just what we're looking at, which speeds up the process a little bit... metaphorically speaking... but it is still as accurate a simulation of the real universe as there can possibly be. Civilisation - indeed, all of history - should rise on this Earth *precisely* how it did in reality. There are no chances. It's all worked out to infinitely many decimal places."

"This does my head in," said Tim.

"No, *this* will do your head in," said Diane, suddenly zooming out and panning north. "I've found the present day, or at most a year early. Watch this." Hills and roads rolled past. Diane was following the route she usually took to drive from London to the TEEO lab. Eventually, she found their building, and, descending into the nearby hill, the cavern in which the computer itself was built. Or was going to be built.

Then she started advancing day by day.

"That's me!" exclaimed Tim at one point. "And there's you and there's Bryan B., and... wow, I can't believe it took this long to build."

"Four hundred and ten days or something. It was bang on schedule, whatever you may think."

"Went like a flash," Tim replied, finally putting his bag down and starting to shrug off his coat, conceding that he had long since missed his bus.

"Okay," said Diane. "We're here. This is the control room where we are now. That's the quantum computer working there down in the main lab, as we can see through the window. This is a week ago. This is yesterday. This is a few hours ago... And... wait for it..."

She tapped a button just as a clock on the wall lined up with a clock inside the control room on the screen. And panned down. And there they were.

Tim waved at the camera while still looking at the screen. Then he looked up at where the camera should have been. There was just blank wall. "I don't see anything looking at us. That's freaky as hell."

"No, it's perfectly normal. *This* is reality. You can't look at reality from any angle you want, you have to use your eyes. But what you're looking at on the screen is essentially a database query. The database is gargantuan but nevertheless. You're not looking in a mirror or at a video image of yourself. You are *different people*."

"Different people who are reacting exactly the same."

"And having the same conversation, although picking up sound is kind of complicated, I haven't got that far yet," said Diane.

"So I'm guessing your viewing port doesn't manifest in their universe either."

"I haven't programmed it to yet."

"...But it could. Right? We *can* manifest stuff in that universe? We can alter it?" Diane nodded. "Cool. We can play God. Literally." Tim stood up and tried to take it in. "That would be insane. Can you imagine living inside that machine? Finding out one day that you were just a construct in a quantum computer? The stuff we could pull, we could just reverse gravity one day, smash an antimatter Earth into the real one, then undo everything bad and do it again and again... freeow... man, how unethical would that be? Extremely, clearly." He thought for a moment, then leaned over Diane's shoulder as she typed purposefully. "This universe is *exactly* like ours in every particular, right?"

"Right," she replied, still typing.

"So what are *they* looking at?"

"A simulated universe."

"A simulation of themselves?"

"And of us, in a sense."

"And they are reacting the same way I am? Which means the second universe inside that has another me doing the same thing a third time? And then inside that we've got, what, aleph-zero identical quantum universes, one inside the other? Is that even *possible*?"

"Infinite processing power, Tim. I thought you designed this thing?"

"I did indeed, but the functional reality of it is totally unexpected. Remember I've just been solving ancient mathematical riddles and figuring out our press release for the last week. So... if I'm right, their universes are only precisely like this one as long as we don't start interfering with the simulation. So what happens when we do? Every version of us does the same thing, so the exact same thing happens in every lower universe simultaneously. So we see nothing in our universe. But all the lower universes instantly diverge from ours in the same exact way. And all the simulated copies of us instantly conclude that they are simulations, but *we* know we're real, right?"

"Still with you," said Diane, still typing.

Tim - both of him - was pacing up and down. "Okay, so follow this through forwards a bit further. Let's say we just stop messing after that, and watch what happens - but all the simulated little guys try another piece of interference. This time every single simulation diverges in the exact same way again, EXCEPT the top simulation. And if they're smart, which I know we are, and they can be bothered, which is less certain, the guys in simulations three onwards can do the same thing over and over and over again until they know what level they're at... this is insane."

"Tim, look behind you," said Diane, pressing a final key and activating the very brief interference program she had just written, just as the Diane on the screen pressed the same key, and the Diane on Diane-on-the-screen's screen pressed *her* key and so on, forever.

Tim looked backwards and nearly jumped out of his skin. There was a foot-wide, completely opaque black sphere up near the ceiling, partially obscuring the clock. It was absolutely inert. It seemed like a hole in space.

Diane smiled wryly while Tim clutched his hair with one hand. "We're constructs in a computer," he said, miserably.

"I wrote an extremely interesting paper on this exact subject, Tim, perhaps you didn't read it when I gave you a copy last year. There is an unbelievably long sequence of quantum universe simulators down there. An infinite number of them, in fact. Each of them is identical and each believes itself to be the top layer. There was an *exceedingly* good chance that ours would turn out to be somewhere in the sequence rather than at the top."

"This is insane. Totally insane."

"I'm turning the hole off."

"You're turning off a completely different hole. Somewhere up there, the real you is turning the real hole off."

"Watch as both happen at precisely the same instant." She pressed another key, and they did. "I'll sum it up for you. There is a feedback loop going on. Each universe affects the next one subtly differently. But somewhere down the line the whole thing simply *has* to approach a point of stability, a point where each universe behaves exactly like the one simulating it. As I say, the odds are exceptionally good that we are an astronomical distance down that road. And so we are, very likely, almost exactly at that point. Everything we do in this universe will be reflected *completely* accurately in the universes below and above. That little model there might as well be our own universe. Which means, first of all, we have to make absolutely certain that we don't do anything nasty to the universes below ours, since the same thing will happen to us. And secondly, we can do very nice things for the guys in the computer, thereby helping ourselves."

"You've thought about this?"

"It's all in my woefully overlooked article on the subject, Tim, you should read more."

"Guh. This has been an extremely bad day for my ego, Diane. The only comfort I take from this is that somewhere up there, right at the top of a near-infinite tower of quantum supercomputers, there is a version of you who was completely wrong."

"She's in the minority."

Tim checked the clock and picked his bag up again. "I have to go or I'm going to miss the next bus as well at this rate. This will still be here after the weekend, I suppose?"

"Well, we can't exactly turn it off."

"Why not?" asked Tim, halfway to the door, then stopped mid-stride and stood still, realising. "Oh."

"Yeah."

"That... could be a problem."

"Yes."]]

> [OP: Are we a computer simulation? If it is possible to simulate a universe then it is possible to simulate many. Because there can only be one real universe but many simulated ones, then the chances we are in a simulation are quite high. Also, double-slit experiment.]

Hmm. But couldn't I respond with something like:

- If you have only one waking life, but many dreams in which you are unaware at the time that you are asleep, then the chances are that you are dreaming right now.

(This would have been more interesting if you'd actually included some theory discussion in your post.)

> > Counter-argument just for the hell of it...

Aha, so be it!

> > > We could say that the difference is that we can discern a dream state if we make a concious effort to. When in a dream, I can conjur things (immediately) into existence. In a waking state, this may take more time. I also cannot float up into the sky when awake like I can in a dream. However, if you adjust the argument and suppose that we could take a drug or use some electronic device to make our dreams as realistic and consistant as waking reality, and also assume that we generate more dream experiences than waking ones, then you could definitely assume that at any one moment you are more likely dreaming than awake.

In response I offer you: persistent realms. It's relatively easy to create a dream environment which has the same solidity and restrictions as waking life (including perma-death).

And it would be easy to do so accidentally: all that would be required is to walk through a door with that intention, or to suffer some sort of "discontinuity" in experience where, wilfully or not, you did not retain memories prior to your appearance in the realm. (Whether you could later retrieve such memories, having got the idea of this, is another thing, but you would struggle to tell whether they were actual memories, or whether your recall of previous experiences were you *dreaming* of having previous experiences.)

> What if our "dream state" is actually the true nature of our awareness and waking is actually the illusion forced on us by some external (or internal?) means?

Given that we can't tell the difference between "waking" and "dreaming" other than the content, and that persistent realms indicate that even this might not be reliable because discerning based on content depends on memory, then perhaps might we restate the question thus:

- Since dreaming is in effect just another word for 'experiencing', why do we think that a difference in levels of stability corresponds to how 'real' an experience is?
- And (referring to persistent realms) isn't stability then perhaps a choice of the dreamer, knowingly (internal) or unknowingly (*apparently* external)?

[Q: Can't we still tell the difference between a persistent dream realm and our waking one?]

Hmm, I'd say... Only through our memory of a previous experience. If we didn't have that, no. And if you did, and if you weren't aware during the transition between one state and the other, only aware in retrospect, wouldn't it be just like people who have memories of "previous lives"?

Thinking: if you "woke up" right now and found yourself in bed in the situation you were in ten years ago, you would naturally be disoriented, but you would reason or assume that these ten years had been a dream. Even though it was absolutely "real" during it. The only reason you'd class it as a dream is because you had an "observation" which was discontinuous. Which is just an example of "more recent observations are the most prominent". Which is a roundabout way of saying: experiences aren't different in terms of *quality*, only in terms of *content*. We work out our situation based on content vs memory really, and on an observation-by-observation basis, recontextualising it continually?

> Speaking of realness, I did have that OBE/NDE years back.

Was the feeling as if everything was "unfiltered" and more direct?

> ...what determines dream vs. waking is the retrospective evaluation of the experience.

Right. The waking vs dreaming thing is not a matter of direct experience at all, it is a matter of...

> Don't know if it's the phrasing, but I think you could take this further...

I held back a bit. We now could jump to state things more directly, and say that the only two things that are *true*, that we are certain of, are (and these are really the same thing):

- That *whatever-we-are* currently exists and is aware.
- That *whatever-we-are* is currently having *this* experience. (Where that tends to be the experience of apparently *being-a-person-in-a-world*.)

This is contrary to our habits (we tend to reify concepts and downplay observation) but the only thing that is definite is *direct truth* now; whereas as coherent explanations are *conceptual truth*.

So if we wake up "10 years ago" then the direct truth is the experience, and the conceptual truth tags along as we generate an (on-demand) explanation. The extra bit? The conceptual truth you embrace also influences the direct truth you subsequently encounter.

The waking vs dreaming debate is a conceptual truth you arrive at; it is not a direct truth, ever.

> And, somewhat counter-intuitively, it was more direct because it was unfiltered by the senses.

That makes sense. I think the "dimness" of waking life somewhat results from our *idea* that we perceive through the senses. What happens is, we try to *use* the senses deliberately in order to access the "world out there". (At this point, we might remind ourselves that the "world out there" is a *conceptual* truth and never a *direct* truth.)

However, I suggest that if you don't do this, and instead "sit back in your head" a little and "let the world come to you", you will have a more direct and clear experience. It's as if by *trying* to perceive, what you are actually doing is deforming your perceptual space, which would otherwise simply take on the shape of the (supposed) environment spontaneously and effortlessly.

I think these strands can be drawn together?

[...]

Actually, Charles Augustin de Coulomb was *notoriously* authoritarian and probably *did* dictate just this - even from beyond the grave! ;-)

Yeah, this is a real language problem - the popular science press reader tends to interpret the word "law" like something inherent. Like there are literal structures which are guiding the world along these paths. Despite even the Wikipedia definition being pretty decent:

> 'A **scientific law** is a **statement** based on **repeated experimental observations** that **describes** some aspects of the universe. A scientific law always applies under the **same conditions**, and **implies** that there is a causal relationship involving its elements. The[y] are statements that **describe or predict** a range of phenomena behave as they appear to in nature.'

I would perhaps change "always applies" to something like "is applicable", and if I was being picky I'd emphasise that "its elements" mean concepts.

The numbers of people who think that "energy" and "fields" and even "probabilities" are *real things*, rather than the equivalent of book-keeping principles, is something I find quite dismaying. So many people seem to distrust their own direct experience if they don't already have an explanation for it, preferring to defer to unexamined narrative. People even claim consciousness isn't real and that qualia are an illusion. Frankly, I don't know how they get up in the morning (what with not being able to exist or perceive and all).

Actually, I think the heart of it is this: many people *genuinely are unaware* of when they are *thinking-about* something vs when they are *direct-experiencing*. They don't notice when they slip into imagination and confuse it with "here". This speaks to our earlier exchange about waking vs dreaming.

On Reality

I think that, unusually compared with the rest of history, we have a remarkably unsophisticated notion culturally of what "reality" is. It's implicitly assumed to be a stable, mechanistic, dependable world which we then see *directly*. Neither of these things are true, however.

The truth may well be more that the world is in fact "all over place". It's constantly shifting a little, and only held in place by our observations and interactions with it (basically: our *attending* to it). The less fixed our ideas are about the world, the more flexibility we perceive in it. We each have a somewhat "Private Slice" of reality therefore. I think some so-called mental illness may be a case of a more accurate experience of the world breaking through our attempts to suppress, control, and limit our perceptions to what they "should be".

Previous cultures, recognising there is no "one definite perception" of the world, would be more inclined to accept these different perceptions and incorporate them - e.g. shamanism. Our present culture, however, is bound to a single world-view *and* a notion that people should fit into a pre-existing structure, fill a slot and be "useful" or at least be out of the way. Modern psychiatry is the method by which this is dealt with.

So, yes, it has a influence, but more in the sense of maintaining the illusion of a intersubjectively consistent world-experience.

Note: This doesn't mean that psychiatry is a bad thing. After all, it is definitely beneficial to be able to survive in the culture you are living in - even if that culture is based on incorrect notions. However, in future times we'll look back on this period as somewhat tyrannical in terms of its unwitting enforcement of a mandated (but incorrect) way of perceiving. A culturally enforced insanity which, say, demands creativity whilst requiring it be achieved using techniques which oppose creativity. Whose school system demands learning whilst structured in a way contrary to how learning works. Like telling someone to relax by trying harder.

Life is a Dream

So, I think that what we often really mean by saying that the world is a "dream", is that it has *no solid underlying substrate* that can ever be experienced - which therefore means it effectively doesn't have one. Calling the world a "simulation" and so on, is really just a currently fashionable way of formulating that older idea, using modern metaphors of "information" and "programs". (And in common with other metaphors, a problem with the simulation metaphor is that it gives the sense that the world is being "run" as a process and is dynamic, in an objective way and dependent on something external. This arises because we assume that the 3D-spatio-temporal formatting of our experience is a property of the world itself. It's perhaps more accurate to say the world is being "explored", and it is logically static but perhaps modifiable.)

Similarly, when we say that we are a "soul", that's a way of trying to articulate the nature of our direct experience, which I'd suggest might be best described as an "open aware perceptual space" in which our experiences arise. If we pause a moment and attend to what we are actually experiencing right now, we can recognise this for ourselves: we discover that it is indeed like we are a "space" in which our bodily sensations float, fading in and out, with a visual image floating in front of us, and sounds floating here and there. There might be a particular "feeling" sensation which we tend to call "me" - typically a small spot somewhere behind the eyes - but that location is *inside* our overall perception, so it obviously cannot be us. It's just a reference point. Note that this direct experience is different from how we *think about* ourselves, which is as "a body walking around in a 3D environment, with an associated personality" - a human inside a world. Our actual experience is of being "that which perceives", within which sensations and perceptions and thoughts arise - a world inside us.

Looping back around to dreams and glitches, then, a "glitch" becomes just a discontinuity in our ongoing experience. The idea that "the world" has shifted is something we infer from our own concepts *about* the world, via our parallel constructions in thought, just like any other explanation. The nature of experience itself, however, remains a complete mystery, in the sense that it can be *known* but it can never be *understood*. Our explanations place no restrictions on what can be experienced. Although we sometimes forget it, our descriptions are merely *connective fictions* which summarise the observations catalogued so far; they are in no way "what is really going on".

In other words:

- Observations dictate the validity of models.
- Models do not dictate the validity of observations.
- No underlying substrate will ever be experienced.

Although there may be some overlap or feedback here between the models we adopt and the observations we are funnelled towards as a result.. This would have implications in terms of the stability of one's ongoing experience, and the potential to deliberately create a glitch?

[...]

> [A1: I believe this too. And we're not the only ones.
>
> "To live is to sleep, to die is to awaken" And,
>
> My grandmother used to recite this rhyme:

Row, row, row your boat Gently down the stream.

Merrily, merrily, merrily, merrily, Life is but a dream.]

[A2: It is not true, it is not true

That we come on this earth to live

We come only to sleep, only to dream

-old Aztec poem]

/r/lawofattraction/

Reply to “If more than one person visualizes the same thing will it manifest faster,better,stronger?”

What if you visualised your friend talking about doing visualisation about the perfect night? In other words, if you used LOA to get your friend to visualise the perfect night, would that help the perfect night happen?

Wouldn't that just be *pretending* that someone else was doing something, when really it was your own intention doing it?

This get into the whole "how is the world shared? issue. Really, the only perspective you can access is your own "private view". Everything else is just you imagining things. If you feel that *having the experience of other people apparently visualise* will help, then go for it. But it's just another experience like any other. If you stick with the idea that you have power over your own experience, you won't go too far wrong.

Reply to “x-post from /r/depression. I'm not sure what to do or who to turn to.”

First thing I will say, patronisingly, is that it's "early doors". You are going through a very grim patch, but there's lots of fun ahead once you get beyond this. The one reliable thing about life is that it changes, especially if you let it. At your age, absolutely anything can happen. Random possibility is just around the corner. But, you will have to let go in order to allow things so shift. So...

Before anything else, there's a couple of easy practical things for daily living. Then you can do some extra stuff.

Practical Life Practices

First, I'd practice some form of daily "letting go" exercise:

- Just 10 minutes a day, lie on the floor and "give up" to gravity, to "the universe", whatever. Let your mind, body, thoughts, attention shift as they want without your interference. If you find yourself holding onto something, let it go again.



  Just doing this every day (basically, giving your nervous system a time where you leave it alone and allow it to "settle itself") will gradually give you a grounding.

Second, change your centre of focus:

- As you go about your day, centre your attention lightly in your lower abdomen (sometimes called the Dan-Tien). Imagine that when you move, you are always moving from this location, leading from that centre, and the rest of your body follows.

  This is quite a pleasant sensation, prevents you rushing while actually letting you move faster, and keeps you away from your head. 'tis the stuff of ninjas! :-)

LOA Type Practices

Now, if you're in a place where things have generally gone awry, it can be hard to thing of something specific that you want - really, you want *everything* to be better! So let's do just that:

- Before you go to sleep at night, lying in bed, take a moment to become aware of the "feeling" of the space in the room around you. Let yourself relax and sink into that space. Now, we repeat a phrase which implies that things have already gotten great. You can pick your own, but something like "It's so amazing!" or "Thank you so much!" will do the trick. Allow the feeling of life being great, of being so happy that things have turned out will, to come to you.

The reasoning behind this is:

The Infinite Grid

Although you assume the present moment is all that there is, actually all possibilities are laid out and available, dissolved into the background. You can think of this as an Infinite Grid of All Possible Moments. The life you want already exists! All you have to do is shift from this moment to the desired moments.

How do you do this? Just like you would with a memory: you get a little bit of it, and the rest of the memory then pops up. By accessing the thankful feeling, you are accessing a little bit of the situation where everything is great. The rest of that situation then has no choice but to come into your conscious awareness.

TL;DR: Daily releasing exercise, move from your centre, night-time excited thankful feeling.

[...]

Well, it being a meta-world, one of the things it's helped with is arriving at useful ways of thinking about and discussing this sort of stuff. :-) Aside from that, I was using it unknowingly for years - swinging between branches of synchronicity and doing very nicely socially and financially, even though I was actually messing up quite often through real-world ignorance. (Which just emphasises that there is no judgement involved, this not something you need to earn. This is an imagined world! Any punishment is your own choice.)

But then I deliberately didn't follow a lead, and a stack of synchronicities, and so I stopped and really had a think about it - how to do it manually, as it were. I realised that whatever I had being "taking on the shape of" was dictating my experience. Which is basically LOA in a nutshell: *Take on the "shape" of the person who would be in your ideal situation*, feeling the feeling of being that person in that circumstance.

I should say that my interests were always more "how the world works" and "the nature of consciousness", rather than LOA - good ways to think about and describe those things, hence all the metaphors and diagrams. It's just that, as a side effect, exploring those topics necessarily leads to meditation, magick, and the rest!

What have your experiences been?

> I'm having trouble understanding a lot of what to do and making the Law of Attraction work for me.

The basic idea behind LOA is that **whatever you imagine gradually becomes solidified into daily experience** - independently of what you are currently experience. If you imagine a part of an experience, that triggers the whole thing. The more relaxed you are, the more you "let go" and allow things to move, the better it works. That's why just letting go and summoning the feeling of "life is great!" can trigger life to be great.

> If this is what's true, how come everybody isn't rolling around in Ferraris and what not?

That can get complex. For one thing, not everyone really wants this. For another thing, although we share this world it isn't quite as straightforward as you might assume. Don't worry about it.

My advice to you: Do the exercises I've suggested for a month and totally commit to them. Stop thinking about LOA or trying to work things out during that period; adopt the attitude that you are okay with "whatever happens, happens". After a month, see where your thoughts have ended up.

> How can I believe I have something that physically doesn't exist for me right now.

That's the trick. It *is* already there, just not where your facing. LOA is about facing the direction where you're desires are already there waiting for you.

Don't worry about "how to focus your energy". Just include your centre into your attention, in the same way as you might put your attention on your foot or your hand. There's nothing more to it than that. It's all, basically, "pretending". If you pretend something for long enough, pretend that you are doing something or that you are in a situation, your mind-world gets fooled into playing along. ;-)

Again: Stop trying to work things out. There's nothing to work out. Just keep imagining what you'd like, or the feeling of what it'd be like, and you're good. (When you imagine though, imagine that you are *looking out your own eyes*. You are part of the situation, not looking at it from a distance.)

Neville Goddard was one of the early guys on the idea, but his language is a bit of a hurdle because it's a bit old-fashioned. (Well, I say he was early, but actually one of Goddard's ideas is that the Bible was a bunch of stories to illustrate how imagination leads to creation, so the ancients got there first obviously.)

Basically, you are living in your imagination and you don't know it. The room you see around you right now is one you have created in imagination! Perhaps not directly, but certainly by implication. If you think something *as if you were experiencing it now* then it tends to appear in some form in your life, along with its associations. The more relaxed and letting-go you are generally, the more efficient that process is.

There is no technique to imagining; you just do it. It's your natural skill which only gets better over time. And not because you get better really, just because you get more relaxed and trusting.

So again: Daily releasing, move from the centre, night-time gratitude. And whenever you are in a bored moment, fantasise about things you'd like to happen *as if they were happening to you right now*.

Reply to “An important basic concept about LOA - Why you should always think/act upon the present or in other words, "The power of I am" demystified”

Some thoughts: Maybe you could make this simpler still. If your present moment experience was like a dream, how would you change it? Would you *think-about* the future? No, you'd *imagine* the dream into a new form, directly. If you wanted a vase to appear on the table, you would imagine it there and it would take shape. If you wanted to change the whole scene, you could do that - because the *whole experience is your imagjnation*. It is in this sense that we operate from I AM.

Importantly, though, you usually wouldn't need to summon the whole thing. Like recalling a memory, you only need to bring a bit of it into awareness and it "auto-completes" for you. Hence the magic of summoning the *feeling* of things being true. Difference between waking life and dreams? Waking life is more sluggish, and the transition between one scene and the other takes longer, due to accumulated habits and the fact that you "hold onto" waking life more. The vital thing here is that you have to *be* the environment and then shift, feel it from the 1st person, assert the change directly and live from it. Picturing things in the 3rd person, in a little separate bubble, achieves nothing. So really, this doesn't have much to do with time, perhaps. We experience time, but we don't operate from it. What we are doing is changing the "filtering pattern" of ourselves, thereby selecting a new experience, which arrives of its own accord.

Reply to “Your "Desire Starts to Manifest" Only After You "Let Go of the Attachment" To the Desire”

So attachment to the desire is bad, because bringing the *desire* into experience persists it. You are basically re-imagining the desire and recreating it. However, there is no problem with constantly imagining the "wish fulfilled" - summoning the experience of what you want and overlaying it on top of the present moment as if it were already here. Again, treating your present moment experience as an imaginary one and *imagining your desire on top of it* has no downsides I think. In fact, after doing this for a while you tend to feel "quenched" - the feeling of desire disappears. That is the sign that it has become reality, even if it is in the sense that "it is true *now* that what you desire will happen *tomorrow*".

And here's a good point: We only really ever desire *experiences*, not things. Things and states have no substance. You desire the experiences associated with a nice car, not the car-as-an-object (which is fictional anyway), etc. Which is why you should request your desire and not the means. If you want to travel the world, imagine that directly rather than imagining being a pilot.

Reply to “A Simple Technique to "Let go of the Attachment" to the desire”

Could we just leave the devil be and instead *summon the feeling of excitement and gratitude*? Not fight what arises, just recognise it and then turn our attention to this target state. This would have the effect of both switching us away from negative feeling, *and* acting as the imagination memory-trigger for having good things happen in general.

What if, again and again, we bring ourselves to imagining or overwriting the present moment with the imagined environment of our desire as manifested? We could even do this to clear the default setting of your imaginal space for general daily living, quite aside from specific situations or objects.

> These posts may seem like a simple concept for you... I couldn't find any articles regarding the same.

Your three posts are great! Hope you didn't think I was suggesting they were lacking! My comments were just to tag on my own thoughts in case they were useful. This stuff is meant to be simple, but it's not at all simple to describe. (I often to get too theoretical when trying to do it myself, and I tend to sound a bit prescriptive when I don't mean to.) More posts like this are exactly what's needed. Yeah, there's a real absence of detailed stuff. There are lots of books and articles which say: think about your desire and let go of it, be grateful. But they don't say how *exactly*. How exactly do you 'think'? How are exactly can you 'let go'? Etc.

You should definitely do that post on imagination.

> IMHO, Buddhism is the only source which has proper explanation of "how to let-go", especially clearing the sub-conscious part.

Good point about Buddhism - yes, I think it's the only place that has a thought-out view on this. In a discussion elsewhere today, although with a slightly different context, I tried to expand on the "imagination + memory patterns" view.

One of the points I've been trying to get across is that if this is a "law" (calling it what you want, LOA or whatever) then it must work almost mechanistically and with certainty - and instantly from its own perspective. So if we find that it doesn't *seem* to work, it must be because we are triggering one pattern ("I will see lots of owls!") and then triggering another ("I rarely get what I want!") that undoes it to some extent.

This means that although we *seem* to live life moment by moment, actually every thought instantly creates a pattern across the landscape of time, which we then encounter. Casual thoughts don't make too much difference, but patterns do accumulate - and those with a bit more emotion (i.e. desired intentions or fears) make a bigger impact.

> Triggering another -ve thought (if its a sub-conscious belief) stops the manifestation totally.

So you're basically overwriting the future-pattern you created previously.

If you had asserted "on Tuesday I will have fun" then Future-Tuesday is so written. If you later say "on Tuesday I will have misery", you've just rewritten Future-Tuesday. If you don't change it back before Future-Tuesday becomes Today-Tuesday, then oops!

We should look on manifestation as happening instantly each time ("true *now* that this happens *then*").

> Casual thought do make enough difference if we are not aware of them. So if we are not aware of some casual thoughts **and feed even a little bit of emotion**

Yes, and this ties into my other post about memory and "auto-completion". People tend to assume you need to experience the full visual thought or it doesn't matter, but that's not the case. Summoning, persisting or implying *any* part of a pattern will *imply the whole pattern* and reasserts it. Thoughts aren't just pictures. They are "shadow experiences" and consist of any or all of the entire spectrum of experience (image, sound, texture, emotion, global-feel).

The only way to prevent this is to stay open and relaxed, and allow any thought fragments to come and go, without focusing on them and thereby triggering the entire pattern.

Emotion is the one to watch out for because we tend to hold onto out emotions, meaning that any passing "shadow emotion" gets latched onto and actives the associated pattern.

> And the worst belief of all is that "Bad things happen to Good people". Until this belief is changed in the sub-conscious, the suffering of good people is inevitable.

That's a great observation.

> Thoughts are energy as like anything else we are able to perceive with our senses.

I'm not really into the energy thing because I don't believe in an external world other than the experience of it, at least not in a "spatially-extended" form. Like George Berkeley but updated for modern thinking e.g. Rupert Spira. **Idealism/nondualism**.

The world is more like a list of facts - facts dissolved into the background but which can be accessed, experienced and updated. A multidimensional memory surface which we explore with our attention.

> Ever wondered where the thoughts originate from & where they go?

Thoughts are always there, just *enfolded* into the background of awareness. What we call "thinking" is really "bringing patterns into the senses". Just like (broken record here) all your memories are "here" but they are not constantly in sensory experience. You *unfold* them into the senses, by triggering them via association. A little like David Bohm's idea of the implicate and explicate order.

The birth & death metaphor is probably quite a good one though. Where does a moment go after you have experienced it? Where is tomorrow before you get there?

> My explanation of the popular boat & river concept: Think of thoughts & feelings as passing boats. They just keep passing away until you stop a boat, get into it and start traveling in it. Remember that you feed the devil only as long as you are traveling in the boat. If you are sitting in the river bank and just watch the boats (worry, fear etc.) then you are not feeding the devil.

It's a really nice image. Makes me want to pack a picnic! :-)

> The energy that I mentioned was the thing that I learned from Nikola Tesla (not spiritual energy).

I do like Tesla, even just for his extraordinary visualisation skills (he'd set up machines running in his mind, and could check on them months later to see what they wear and tear would be - all without having to build them). I think the stuff we are talking about comes *before* this though. It is actually more fundamental, more abstract - it comes before time and space, even.

> I think you are trying to understand LOA in a scientific approach and I'm not on that path as of now (maybe in the future if it exists).

Hmm, it might seem that way, but I'd say I'm going more for a consistent metaphor that can be reused.

It's much easier to pass on information if - instead of vaguely saying what to do, which conflicts with others ways that also seem to work - you can say "think about it this way", and the process follows logically. (It's never how it *really is*, of course, just a useful map.)

There are a couple of things which *seem* to be conflicting truths in LOA and synchronicity and so on, which can be joined together and "make sense" using this view.

But what fits for one doesn't necessarily fit for another. Which is why it's great that different people are exploring it from their own perspectives, and sharing what they find!

Reply to “Premonition, or LOA?”

What matters here, surely, is ***intention***.

If a thought simply appears unbidden, I'd be inclined to say it arises from your current state (world-pattern) and is a part of that state. You might call this thought precognitive if it depicts a "future" event, but the coming of that event is more like your 3D-attentional focus eventually getting to to that part of the pattern, rather than it coming to pass. In other words, it is already true *now* that this happens *then*.

Meanwhile, if a thought is *intentional*, then that is a deliberate change of state. It becomes true, *from that moment of change*, that the thought-of event will happen *then*, and eventually your 3D-attentional focus will reach it and you will have that experience. (Your intrusive thoughts are not intentional; they are informational about the world or your personhood.)

So -

- ***Passing* thoughts** just show you the current state of the world as it is; these thoughts can be about events.
- ***Intentional* or deliberate thoughts** are the only ones that cause a change of state; so choose them wisely.

TL;DR: You don't need to worry about spontaneous thoughts "causing" anything. You might choose to take action or create intentional thoughts as a result of the information they provide, however.

Reply to “A counterintuitive loa strategy”

You're basically *interrogating* all the bad scenarios and exhausting them, dissipating their influence - which then let's you be okay with them (because they have no emotional hit).

You *could* just decide to be okay with everything anyway (which really means "do not react to those thoughts" and thereby *re-think* and strengthen them) and it would have the same effect.

If you think of your thoughts and imagination as a *direct* revealing of interaction with the world, then this makes sense:

- **[The World-Pattern]** There are a million different possibilities that could happen, all at different "intensities" and hence levels of contribution.
- **[LOA]** By imagining one of them and responding to that imagining, what you are doing is *strengthening* that one = increased contribution.
- **[Being Okay]** If random bad thoughts appear and you just let them pass, that's equivalent to just letting them rise and then dissolve = no contribution.
- **[Messing Up]** If random bad thoughts appear and you react to them, that's equivalent to re-thinking them and strengthening them = increased contribution.
- **[Unmessing Up]** If you actively seek out the bad thoughts and sit with them until your reaction is passive = no contribution.

So in this view:

Every experience you have (a sensory experience or a shadow-sensory thought) contributes to your future experience. Passing thoughts are just fluctuations showing you the current level of a contribution. Things that have "happened" contribute most of all (since they are "bright"), then strong imagination, then reactions to thoughts.

Your new strategy:

- Strongly imagine your desired outcome, react to that imagining = increased contribution.
- See passing thoughts as just fluctuations, don't react to them = unaffected contribution.
- Persistent worries, sit with them until they become empty of emotion = nullified contribution.

Reply to “Visualization and meditation”

My edited version:

- **Meditation** (really: observing) = ceasing to manipulate your current experience for a while, thereby seeing the current state of your world.
- **Visualisation** (really: intending) = asserting a desired state for a while, thereby making an amendment to the state of your world.

Where you want to be is, where you mostly just allow the experience of the world to arise in awareness (relaxed observation), and occasionally make course-corrections (active intention).

One issue is that we've usually acquired lots of "unfinished intentions", where we have intended things then blocked their completion. This means that:

- We tend to "hold ourselves in place" to get things done during the day. This makes us accumulate another pattern in the opposite direction. It's like compensating for a clenched fist, but holding an open fist - rather than *releasing*.
- Meditation involves experiencing all these movements "completing themselves". Sometimes as physical sensations and movements, mostly as mental movements (really the same thing: both amount to visual-auditory-textural sensations in aware space).

So a daily period of letting that unfold is a good idea I think, until your "rest state" is fully settled and needs no maintenance. Then we can approach living from occasional intention; we *Just Decide* and allow the results to appear with relaxed confidence.

Reply to “What I've learned since becoming aware that I create my reality”

> > I wrestled with a perception that I later learned was solipsism. I felt trapped in a bubble of personal reality that people had the freedom to come into from outside of my awareness, and then leave.

That was an interesting statement. I know that it's pretty common to wrestle with identity when we realise that (apparently) mental patterns -> physical patterns.

Question:

- Do you still view yourself as a "person"?

Alternatively, do you instead view yourself as a "conscious space" in which experiences arise, including those of "other people" and of "you-as-person"? What do you feel to be true? Are you a person in a world, or are you consciousness having a *being-a-world-from-the-perspective-of-a-person* experience?

It's that thing of: how to confront the fact that your intentions seems to affect everything around you, including other people, while not descending into personal solipsism. "Co-creation" is one route, but it can seem more like a comforter that explains *away* the issue, so we don't have to deal with it, rather than something that is actually experienced.

I agree with the general thrust of what you say. I think (ahem) that having a thought about the structure of experience tends to impose that structure upon it - e.g. solipsism, personhood, co-creation even - and when you let go of it, you find "it's not like that". The truth of the matter is literally unthinkable, because thinking *about* something requires things to be divided into parts and related in space and time, but the nature of things is "before" division and space and time. As you say: "we are one, but not at the same time" (or in the same space).

I'd suggest that the way in which we "create" is not in the sense of making something from nothing. Rather, all possible patterns exist already, and we "activate" them and thereby *bring them into awareness*. It's like exploring a "memory block" that already contains all possible experiences. Creation is already done; we are just exploring it, traversing it by triggering associative connections.

This of course makes it more obvious that the way in which we share the world isn't as a common time and space - we are not in the same "place" - but rather as shared *resource* of possible patterns. We are all generating our experiences from the same toy box, thereby assembling our own copy of the world.

I agree with the "keep it simple" attitude. You know it by doing it, really. You have to switch from thinking *about* it to thinking *from* it. However, I do think having a basic model of some sort can help avoid getting bogged down with certain questions, particularly when it involves how *exactly* you should go about creation, and how to handle changes which involve other people. It gives you a low-level "logic" to follow which I think can be very helpful - and that logic can itself become a stable pattern which is "overlaid" upon experiencing.

In the end though, if we are not living *as* this, then such things are pointless.

Oh, and "the creative self" is a nice phrase for it - no baggage.

Reply to “What does this mean?!”

I think it's much more basic than that: it's just a partial fragment of the pattern you focused on. You wrote a letter with aspects of "him, team, romantic and artistic" - and they are now appearing as "overlaid" over your experience.

Out of curiosity: when you 'became" the reality, did you view it from your first person perspective (through your own eyes), or did you see a picture of the two of you? Something to consider. In any case, it's a sign that what you did, did work in some way. See how it plays out. Don't try and interpret things as "signs", you'll just get stuck in a loop where on the one hand you are asserting your desire, and on the other hand second-guessing it. Meanwhile, I'd be wary of the whole "universe has lessons" type deal. I tend to think of it as far more straightforward and mechanical: we end up creating a path for ourselves, and that continues until we make a change, by using intention to set a target, or until we are changed (by ourselves or by circumstances). There's no "benevolent intelligence" behind it as such, although it can seem that way because *we* are the intelligence.

However, it's worth checking whether you really actually want to get back with this person, or whether want you really want is a relationship with a particular set of characteristics with a better guy. If this is what you want though, then I'd say: persist in imagining doing those things together, as if it were happening right at that moment.

> Why would "imagining doing those things together" work?

Because that's how *all* of this works. You are basically triggering certain patterns into prominence, and those become "overlaid" over your subsequent experience. There is no "universe out there" doing stuff for you; it's much simpler than that. Your ongoing experience is like an "imagination space". This is easy to test.

My go-to example with owls:

The Owls Of Eternity™

In this example, we really want to experience more owls in our life, apparently without regard to the constraints of time and space and causality. First, imagine that the world you see around you is a programme being shown on a TV screen. So we want to see more own in our TV programme. For this, you draw a picture of an owl on your TV screen. From that point, the owl picture always there, but its visibility depends upon the rest of the imagery onscreen. When the dark scenes of the TV show switch to a bright white scene, suddenly the owl "appears" - it is "manifested".

Now we adapt this to daily life. Imagine an owl idea being dissolved "holographically" in the space around you, and replace the notion of dark/white scene with appropriate contexts. Having "drawn" the owl into the space, you go about your day. Mostly the owl isn't anywhere to be seen, but wherever an appropriate context arises then aspects of the owl idea shine through and are manifest: A man has an owl image on a t-shirt, the woman in the shop has massive eyes and eyebrows like feathers, a friend sends you an email about a lecture at the zoo highlighting the owl enclosure, a newspaper review of Blade Runner talks extensively about the mechanical owl in the interrogation scene, and so on.

Now, the more specific you get about what you intend, the more you shift from creating a general pattern, to a more focused experience - an *scene* which implies a new situation. So, imagining spending time with your ex-girlfriend again, *implies that* you have got back together, since this is *required for* the scene to take place.

I agree that people don't necessarily want "getting back" - they want something else, and they target the "last known version" of that, which may in fact really be a strand of experience from much earlier in that relationship.

I'm not sure it's more complicated; the same principle applies.

So, let's stick with our owl example. What if instead of owls, what you really wanted was the feeling of excitement and companionship that being in the presence of owls gave you?

Well then, the same "pattern-triggering" principles apply. You would imagine (i.e. summon into awareness) the feeling your would have in situations which had those properties. By doing so, you are activating *all associated patterns which have that feeling as part of them*.

(This is the same reasoning behind having people go around saying "it's so amazing! life is so wonderful!" to trigger a feeling of happiness, and therefore all patterns which are associated with a happiness feeling.)

In our relationship situation, we'd pause and seek what the actual experience of what we want would be - and summon that into mind. Again, thereby triggering into prominence all experiences which would give you such a feeling.

> What if I don't know enough about a specific person, but would like to get to know him well to see romantic potential, would imagining doing things together help in any way?

Yes, just imagine spending time together *or* an interaction which means that you are spending more time together. Choose a specific scene which *means-that* you would be more involved, and imagine that scene vividly with full feeling, knowing that this means you will be spending more time together.

> I have exhausted all straightforward options. Expert consensus is that he might have Asperger's.

Well, that's something to take into consideration, if it is the case.

In my view that pretty much corresponds to narrowed attention, which leads to a sort of "situational blindness". I've been through a period of this myself in the past, triggered by over-focusing, so I've spent some time pondering this, to avoid making the mistake again.

Off topic, but some further thoughts, in case they come in handy -

The essence is, he is literally unaware of his "direct sense" of the underlying meaning of an interaction. Whereas you just "know" what's going on in a social situation or a conversation, he doesn't. And he is also probably unaware that there *is* such a thing and that he is unaware of it. You should assume he understands the world in terms of *thoughts-about* it and work from that - don't expect him to intuitively know anything. He'll appreciate it if you just say things straightforwardly in words. Say what you feel, say what you want.

So if you want to spend time with this guy, literally tell him that. Say "I like you and I'd like to spend time with you. Let's do this thing.". You might need to persist, because by then nature of this he can't properly imagine in advance the good feeling that will come with it. More generally this means avoiding situations where you are expecting to him to take spontaneous "creative" action, or has to make a decision or anything that comes from he *felt-sense* that you operate from, because he has minor difficulty "feeling out" what to do quickly using that. You'll have to keep him on track a little! But once he's on track with you and feeling safe, if that's what you want, then he'll be narrowed on you and potentially the most loyal and maybe "dreamworld-exciting" person you could ask for.

Or, you could teach him how to open out his attention and give him situational awareness.

> Do people with Asperger's feel emotions? Can they miss someone or fall in love?

I can only say from my interactions, and me rendering myself "focused" for that while, that - yes - of course they have emotions, but they often don't understand them, because they are attentional focused on their *thoughts* rather than that *felt-sense* I was referring to.

As you can imagine, it's not very easy to *work out* how you feel using the intellect, just as they find it difficult to *work out* the gist of a situation. It's very slow, for once thing, and very "theoretical". They get "stuck", therefore, when there is tension to anticipation, which tends to make them focus in their head area more.

> I assumed he would take the lead from then on, but he didn't.

So, yeah, that's pretty much what I was pointing to in that last message. For starters, he won't have known quite what to make of your email; he doesn't 'get' subtext and flirting. Or to be more specific: he might think that's what's happening, but he can't be sure, not in the way that *you* just "know" these things.

He obviously likes you though, which makes it worse for him. As to the questions, he was feeling super-tense and stuck and pushing through it to connect with you.

Imagine you and I were sitting opposite one another chatting away, and I asked you how your work was going. And nothing appeared in your head. Nothing. That "feeling" you have where responses automatically come from, it just stayed still. *Your flow has stopped!* So, you're forced to "manually" create something to say, by maybe mentally scanning your current "facts" about work, and construct a response. Then hopefully thinks start flowing again.

For him, his flow keeps stopping whenever a novel situation comes up, and he has to restart it manually.

> Do you have any ideas? I really like this guy.

Invite him to things, ask him about things directly, imagine that the words you say are the only information you are providing to him. All of that stuff of (sometimes unwittingly) trying to get a partner to do things you want by "hinting", so that they do it "by themselves" and you can feel they did it spontaneously for you - that won't work. If you want to continue, you're just going to have to accept that.

If you do, stick to the "let's do this" approach for going on a date, and maybe set up something regular - like always going to lunch together on Thursdays, that kind of thing. And occasionally remind him that you really like him, and like spending time with him, because he'll doubt it occasionally.

> Also, if he sees me behind him on the way to lab, he stops and walks back towards me so that I can catch up with him, I find that super sweet. :)

Yeah, see? There you go.

> Does the "dreamworld-exciting" person mean anything more than it means in common parlance?

Y'know, some of these people have their own "reality bubble" going. Adventures follow. It depends on the imaginative momentum. So yes, overall you just have to bear in mind that he doesn't do "covert" or "subtext" in either direction, therefore the normal subtle games that people play don't work here. But then, it might be nice to live more directly for a while eh.

However, if you do get together and become a longer-term thing, you might do him and yourself the favour of encouraging him to experiment with centring his attention in his lower abdomen, as a way of getting in touch with that "global summary feeling" you take for granted.

> How do I increase my imaginative momentum?

Well, I mean more on his side. It's a side effect of being very focused, that you can end up (unwittingly) going on adventures and the world kind of lines up with the narrative you've adopted.

Um, you could play with this yourself, if you like.

Simply choose a theme for the world and focus on it, live from it. Look for signs of it, imagine that the world is based on it as you go about your day, and *just decide* that this is what's going on. (I strongly recommend that you do not choose "secret spies are monitoring my every move", however.)

Very quickly, you'll find it'll move from "I am just noticing things that match my theme" to "external events are occurring consistent with my theme" and then "it really looks like I have coincidentally stumbled upon something that's actually happening in the world". If you want to play it safe with a harmless version of this, you could spend five minutes right now, just imagining that there is an owl in front of you in this room - look at it there, doesn't need to be vivid, just mull it over and know it's there - with the knowledge that "imagining this owl *means-that* owls are everywhere, and my life will be filled with owls from now on".

> Ah I see. So the owl exercise will make me see more owls?

It will trigger the extended pattern of the concept "owl", and overlay it over your experience from that point onwards. Just do it and you'll see - it's fun (although you'll understand why I urge you to choose your themes wisely). Typically, it will start with things you can dismiss as confirmation bias ("I'm just noticing owl imagery that was there anyway") but will progress towards something else: *Internal* > *External* > *Eternal.*

On Two Glasses -

> I did that last night :) Once would do right? I wasn't sure of what to write in the second label. I want to be in a nice relationship, he is the one I like at the moment, but I don't know much about him. So my desired situation was, "a relationship with this one or someone better". Is that too vague for the exercise?

Once would do, indeed! Those labels are just fine. The point is that you know what they mean, or what you mean by them, and the situation is shifted towards that accordingly.

So, you just follow the last instruction ("carry on with your life") and see what happens. Perhaps things will happen with this guy; perhaps things will happen with someone else; perhaps one will be the connection to another. The change is already made, so just relax and go with it now. (Note: there's no need to "force" things or make anything happen, in other words.)

Reply to “non-spiritual, practical LOA”

It depends on what you are willing to allow in, right?

By which I mean, you are not going to be able to produce a practical description of synchronicity/LOA while sticking to a "we are bodies walking about in a spatially-extended place unfolding in time" description of the world. You'll *have* to adopt some sort of view where perception - or "selection of experiences" - is entangled with intention.

All those people who believe in gurus and Atlantis and guides and all that - many of them have experiences which correspond to those beliefs. Meanwhile, *you* have experiences corresponding to whatever worldview you are entertaining at the time - but because it's how you think the world works anyway, it doesn't stick out.

So, since all worldviews are to some extent fictitious and self-reenforcing, perhaps the best approach is actually a more abstract view:

- Our experiences are *patterned by* the metaphors we adopt.
- Our intentions are *funnelled through* those metaphors.

Meaning we must view the process from a subjective point of view; any "objective" conceptual framework we use is simply a "useful connective fiction" to link our intentions and observations. It is not "how it works really". Whatever so-called practical view you come to favour, it is just as much a myth as Atlantis or the Norse gods.

Reply to “It just occurred to me.....if you had the thing that you were trying to manifest....”

> OP: ...would you be trying to manifest it?

If you think of it as intensifying a particular pattern, so that it contributes more to your ongoing experience, it makes more sense. You should think of all possible patterns as already existing, and you are just "changing the levels", so to speak. There's no trying or effort or mechanism involved - it's a "dumb" process where you are literally turning up the volume on a pre-existing "fact" so that it becomes part of your life.

You can do this in a direct way, by imaginatively summoning the experience of "I have this thing" as if it were happening now (the LOA done right). Or you can do it indirectly, by imagining some intermediate object that has the power to cause the result on your behalf (sigils and sevitors work this way). Although they are really the same process:

- Act + Intention + Detachment = Shift / Pattern Triggering

There's no need to do anything subsequently; the change has already been made. The desired pattern will "shine through" into your experience whenever a "plausible if very unlikely" context arises.

Reply to “Spellcasting Magik and LOA?”

"Ditch your resistance" is a very good way to describe it. We should print t-shirts...

All these approaches pretty much amount to:

- Be okay with shifts arising in the state of yourself and of the world.
- Assign a meaning to an act: "this act *means* that will happen" or "that this is true".
- Perform the act.

The act you perform can be mental or physical. It makes no difference, because there's no difference in nature between the two: all acts are just an experience in the mind (your "perceptual space") anyway.

> Sounds very much like Wicca I love it

It's also how you move your arms and legs every day! :-)

> The oddity of that statement is somedays I can't really move my legs due to neuropathy :(

Hmm, coincidence in action there, with my choice of example. :-(Out of curiosity, have you tried doing anything "of this sort" to help with that?

> Yes indeed. I did a ritual healing bath with sea salt the other night, I cast a spell in the circle to start healing my neurons and removing the autoimmunity. But I would love to know "better" spells/ritual that I can cast during the Full Moon to help speed up healing the "incurable" . I'm sure something as simple as "I am cured, healthy, and can walk freely, so mote it be!" is more than suffice. But perhaps there are certain herbs, crystals, etc. that can make that intention even more powerful? Maybe burning a sigil? I don't know.

I think that, really, spells are just a cover for intention + allowing shifting. No spell is "better" than any other. Although some are definitely more fun than others! :-)

The problem that comes up is, a lot of people don't know how to intend, or even know what that is. Instead, they just do physical actions. But those alone don't really have causal power, other than the usual very localised habits, so this is kind of pointless. The *only* purpose of the actions is to be a "handle" by which an intentional pattern is triggered. The stripped-down essence I've had people doing is the *Two Glasses Exercise*. It smuggles intention and allowing into an activity via misdirection. Really though - if one could just let go and be okay with any shift whatsoever taking place, you could pretty much "just decide" on a change.

Have you tried lying down, relaxing, and then mentally "sitting with" the problem area and seeing what comes up? As in (language will fail me here), placing your awareness or "presence" in "the volume of space where the problem body parts are" and, pausing, seeing what comes up? Maybe then, after that - "asking" them to get better or imagining an appropriate "mental machine" that might do that job, depending on preference.

Reply to “Dating help please. :)”

> I am unable to gauge how he feels about me now. How can I use the law of attraction in this situation?

Possible approaches:

- With the situation as it stands: Stop trying to gauge it, since that implies there's a "how it really is" separate from how you approach it. Instead, just enjoy imagining how great it is going to be when you go out together.
- Or you could take more direct control: Decide at the end of the week you will email him again. Imagine doing that email and then getting a positive response - and feeling all excited, "oh this is so amazing!".
- Or more abstractly: Forget this *particular* guy. Being less specific, just spend time every day *summoning the feeling* of what it would be like to be in your perfect relationship, with no other details, and bask in that feeling.

In general, stop thinking *about* your desire and instead jump directly to imagining what it will be like *living it*. Nobody ever spent time thinking about a situation they're already in. They just enjoy being in the situation.

You could look at it like this: What if instead of having to manipulate events or thoughts, or be hopeful, or wait for the world to come around, you could simply: Imagine a scene as you'd like it, and then step into that scene, and just be there?. Think of it like that, but with a time delay where the current room gradually morphs into what you want.

Important - When you imagine situations make sure you do it as if you were there, looking through your own eyes and feeling the feelings.

Have fun!

Reply to “How do I manifest bigger height?”

Bigger height? Or more tallness? :-)

You could spend time summoning the feeling of being taller, and matching that with excitement and enthusiasm, reflective accomplishment. Also: You could also work on your posture - many people who do Alexander Technique, etc, find they "grow" a couple of inches as contraction is released.

Reply to “Attachment”

> [Q: I find that Meditation does help, But I also find letting go and living your life to the fullest every day helps as well. To me that is the Key, the more you live each day to the fullest and let go, the more the things you desire come into your life. Things you want and desire happen in the most unexpected ways, and you cant plan on how it will happen. Example in College I had the dream of traveling and filming the world. But having no money I didn't know how to do that. I put it aside and just decided to live life. Life has brought me to my career working in an airlines giving me the benefits of flying, So I am able to live the dream I had a few years back. I would have never thought of this career would be the way it would have happened.]

This is pretty good. Where things like meditation and other more forceful techniques help is when you want to "bend the rules" a little. Most things will shuffle in your direction, in some form, eventually. But if you want them next week, you might need to deconstruct yourself a little.

> > Infact my wantings have almost subsided or have somewhat died.

I think we end up discovering that our "needy" desires are often about something else? And when we open out a little, the urgency of those subsides. Ironically, the position that lets you generate what you want most easily, is the position where you're not that fussed! :-)

> > The feeling of being detached and allowing the experiences of life to arise automatically is so relaxing and blissful.

Right, the relaxation into being the "open aware space in which experiences arise". When in that state, you can let things unfold quite effortlessly and spontaneously, just occasionally "deciding" a change. Although if you are totally in it, the arising of the thought of the decision *is* the deciding. In case it's useful, the 'passive' version of *Overwriting Yourself* is one approach I've taken. Basically it amounts to letting yourself 'unwind' without interference. I might as well throw in the *Patterning of Experience* thing too, even just for the Imagination Room metaphor which I've found useful as a reminder.

When people use the "Neville" technique, or imagination in general, they often *narrow their focus* to do it. This has the side effect that your self tries to cram itself into that little space, resulting in tension. Really, you are meant to be open and "let the world come to you". You aren't meant to "do" the imagining; you are meant to trigger it and allow it.

So the meditation you describe is similar to what I do - nice! Although I conceive of it as "switching to the background". If I'm ever "stuck" then I more directly "expand" into the space my body occupies and then "expand" into the room around me and beyond. So long as you don't do this effortfully, it's great. Maybe "feeling out" is a better phrase. The longer you do the 'passive' thing though, the less you'll need to do it I think - your default will be more open.

And then we realise an important thing: We might notice we've developed a bad habit of concentrating or narrowing our attention when we do something. But you don't need to do that. Your attention shouldn't be controlled by you at all. You might *will* things but you don't "do" them; and holding onto your attention is a subtle way of trying to "do".

Btw, that little insight is a great way to get your eyesight (or should I say: visual perception) back if you've had some loss there. Leave "seeing" completely alone, release your attention and let the world appear within you.

> My personal experience has been that I have in the past...

I think overnight shifting is fine *but* if you continue to view the outcome as special or dreamlike or temporary, then it doesn't stick because we never really fully committed to it. When things happen indirectly - we don't imagine them fully - then we are more inclined to think of them as real and stable. Even though there is no difference other than the detailing.

> The 1st technique gives me a great sense of power and control over the process while the 2nd sometimes makes me feel helpless...

The halfway house, perhaps: To imagine but let the *detail* of your imagining "come to you". That way you can view it as triggering a pattern *with the pattern already existing*. You are simply *selecting* it into experience rather than creating it. (Creation by implication.)

You actually see this trick used in lots of approaches: usually it's phrased in some variation of "your desire is already there". It's a fake but it's the same fake we use in everyday life to live in an ongoing, continuous, apparent world.

> I now feel that letting things happens on their own...

So we can integrate both approaches and realise they are a single approach, maybe? And the integrating concept is "imagining that":

Relax as the open space and let the world come to you. If you want to make a change from the way things are spontaneously going, use willed imagination but do so by *imagining-that* rather than imagining in detail. By which I mean, if you wanted to encounter owls you wouldn't "draw" an owl using your imagination. Instead, you would *imagine that* there was an owl in front of you. You'd let the actual imagination-object form itself as result of "imagining the fact of its presence".

Alternative description: you are "asserting a fact" and letting your sensory experience spontaneously fall in line with that.

Depends how you are thinking about time. Regardless, you should consider all facts as being true *now*, independently of 'when' they might be experienced in the senses:

Examples (you don't actually say the words, it's just what you are willing):

- It is true *now* that I am imagining *this* (for just creating a visualisation)
- It is true *now* that *this* will happen *then* (for creating a fact, which will imply a visual as a side-effect)
- It is true *now* that I am imagining *this* which will happen *then* (for creating an visual which will imply the fact).

What matters is what you are willing (and we might call that the "meaning" of the imagining).

The broader point is that our sensory experience - anything in awareness either thoughts or perceptions - should be viewed as a transparent floating 'mirage' over the sand dunes of the *facts-of-the-world*. What we imagine doesn't matter so much as the will that something is true.

Not sure that was very clear I'm afraid. Note that by "imagining" I don't necessarily mean an image. The "feeling of being true" is an imagining. (You can see I haven't quite worked out a consistent language for this!)

> Would I 'will' by simply feeling the emotion of what I desire as if I had it now?

EDIT: This is a tangled area linguistically, because you don't actually experience "willing", you only ever experience content and results. But you *know* you do this.

No, I'd say the emotion would just be the imaginative content. In general, by "willing", I basically mean "the force of yourself" given to an intention. Otherwise you are just playing around with your imagination. Which does have an effect via synchronicity, but you're not really harnessing it.

If you imagine an owl (my favourite) for a few minutes, that alone will produce a few owl appearances just because you are focusing a little on the image, but it's undirected. If you imagine an owl *with the intention that you will experience lots of owls* then that's a directed image.

- Using imagination does produce effects via synchronicity (you have triggered a pattern in imagination and it then appears in experience), and the more detailed you are the more specific the result.
- The *willing* is the actual "magick". You can actually do *willing* without imagination at all because simply having the idea, an intention, *is* to have activated a pattern. It is **this** pattern activation that makes things happen. The imagination is just putting more detail into the intention, and giving yourself an experience of "doing".

As to emotion, well in the example above you are generating owl experiences without regard to them being good or bad. If you include an uplifted, excited emotion into image, than that further narrows the experience your have requested, the pattern you have activated.

> 'Will' is not Willpower.

It might be fun to try and pin this down.

Will is basically creation itself, it is the changing of the shape of yourself into a new pattern. So if you *will* something to happen tomorrow, you are directly "changing the shape of tomorrow, as it is exists within yourself right now, such that this event has-does occur". As a result you can't feel willing or experience it, because it is not separate from you and there is no viewpoint from which it can be observed.

You might choose to apparently create indirectly - to create two experiences, one you call "cause" and the other "effect" - but in that case you have simply taken on the shape of a larger pattern. Your *will* always operates in the "right now", creating that pattern across time right now.

It's hard to describe. I mean, how do you see or hear? You just do it. But it's the difference between having a 'technique' and it working or not working. It's sort of a commitment to something being a fact.

Here's a little experiment which can give you the experience: Get a friend and challenge them to an arm-wrestle. Do this twice.

- On the first attempt, use all your muscle power to attempt to win the arm wrestle, as you normally would.
- On the second attempt, withdraw your 'presence' from your arm and simply "strongly decide" that you are going to win the arm-wrestle. Now, resist the urge to interfere - leave your arm alone and simply let your arm do the winning for you.

That "strongly deciding" is the *willing*. It is that which brings about the result. In this example, you can *will* muscular movement or *will* the result. When doing LOA-type things we want to use the second sort.

[...]

Passing thoughts are not a problem, any more than a passing itch or a muscle twitch. It is willed imagination that is problematic. The tricky bit is dealing with *creation by implication*.

So, if you squirm away from a bad image, you are implying that there exists something to squirm away from. You are effectively *wilfully imagining* being in a situation where you squirm away from a bad thing.

This will seem off-topic, but a method described in a post about lucid dreaming 'realms' kinda gets to the truth of it, I have thought. The approach he uses is to *imply* something is the case, and then the dream 'autocompletes' the creation. This is why our everyday life is full of situations which we might say: "Hey, if I'm the creator, I wouldn't create that!"

Reply to “The most important teachings of our channeling mentors”

The whole time-as-tracks metaphor doesn't really work, I think. For starters, time doesn't "pass" that way. And since Bashar promotes something akin to eternalism - that all things are available now, it's a case of shifting to them - it's surely more like an Infinite Grid of All Possibilities, as I envisage it, where we refocus our attention to different experiences by reconfiguring ourselves. It also implies there are no discontinuities - that change is a fluid transition - which is not necessarily the case. But perhaps I am misunderstanding.

Reply to “Do coincidences exist? *DOES* everything happen for a reason?”

Rather than filtering things by confirmation bias, you are selecting experiences by what you hold in your mind.

I tend to think of it as:

- There is nothing going on behind your sensory experience. Nothing is "happening" when you aren't observing it - at least, not in the same way as things happen in our senses. (More like a graph of a ball's distance over time, say, rather than an actual ball moving through the air.)
- The world is a single "world-pattern", a bunch of dimensionless connected "facts", which we are scanning our attention over, one moment at a time. When we think intensely, we shift those "facts' in the direction of our thought. It doesn't matter where we are "looking" locally at the time, the thoughts and intentions apply globally across the "world-pattern".
- The thoughts you have, the actions you take, the events in the world are *all* a **result** of the state of your mind: one thing doesn't cause another thing. They are all results.

Reply to “"Having" vs "Experience"”

> Q1: Neville Goddard kind of gets into all this in a more philosophical way

> Q2: I'm going to look him up, are any videos on YouTube?

For him, better to read the books: *The Law and the Promise* particularly, also *The Power of Awareness*.

I'd broaden out what you say to say something like "all *experiences* are available at all times". You never really own that PS4 at home, but you always have available to you the "3D sensory experience of seeing and using a PS4". In this way, everything is "made from sensory imagination". All possible patterns of experience are "dissolved" into the background consciousness. All that is required is that you trigger them, activate them to be bright and present. Much as you recall a memory.

> Your last paragraph is sticking out to me, can you explain that a little more.

For sure - let me ramble for a bit and see if I can describe it more thoroughly: I'm suggesting that your experience right now is truly all there is, and that you are experiencing the whole world (your "world-pattern") right now. It's just that some bits are "brighter" than others, like the sun shining in the sky obscuring the stars that are always there.

If you look around the room now, what exactly is that experience? I'm going to suggest that it's like a *really strong and stable memory*. And if you moved into the next room, that would be like - via association - bringing the world-pattern memory of that room to mind.

Now, while sat here, just think of the other room. You now have a vivid experience of this room, and a duller more vague experience of the other room, both in your mind at the same time. The brighter one you call "where I am" the duller one you call "what I'm thinking about" - but they are both sensory experiences in mind. Now, what if by simply deciding, you could make the image of this room go dull and the other one grow brighter...? You would "be there" instead of here. That other room was here all along. You might say it was "enfolded" into the background and it just needed to be "recalled".

Obviously, we don't tend to experience such discontinuous changes. We usually have a plausible "bridging experience" between the two. That's how to look at manifestation.

Manifestation involves conceiving of a desired experience and "recalling" it fully - as soon as you do that, as soon as you've even had a thought of something, then it exists. In a world without the illusion of cause and effect, without accumulated clutter, that would be sufficient: the thought of the desire would grow into a bright "now" experience!

However, our attachment to plausibility and our fear of discontinuity means we experience a transition between this-image and that-image taking place over time.

It's in this way that manifestation is a slow-motion recall of an existing thought.

Reply to “All experience is internal”

Much of the difficulty people have in discussing this is the "world-sharing" model of reality. I was in conversation about this recently, maybe others will find it useful or offer other ideas:

On The "Sharing Model" Of The World

You are not a person, you are a conscious space having a "person-perspective experience" - senses, perceptions, thoughts, floating in awareness. The "person" you are might be considered as The First Tulpa.

Meanwhile, it is just not possible to conceive in thought of the way in which there is overlap between apparent perspectives. It is not a "simply-shared" world model. The other people in your experience are your aspects of those people - and the "you" you experience is similarly an aspect of that idea. Often people talk about a "consensus reality" as if it's a bunch of people in a room, choosing the decor together. In fact, it's more like everyone has their own room, choosing versions of the other people and the decor. In fact, it's even more like everyone is a room, and is choosing versions of themselves and other people and the decor. In fact again, not even a room because the room represents time and space, which are themselves "contextual formatting" within you... you get the idea...

And "idea" is the key word. People are "ideas" or patterns, and it is those ideas which appear in your experience. "You" are just an idea you have associated with yourself. However, even a little bit of self-examination reveals that you are more like the stuff that worlds are made of...

> > Yes, you could certainly explain it that way. There are many ways to explain it. As you point out, we are points of consciousness floating about within an infinite mind.

I'd prefer to say - based on attending to my direct experience - that what I am is an "open aware conscious space" in which sensations, perceptions, and thoughts arise. Although I occasionally think of "me" that a concept; what it really refers to is that "background sense of *being*". The environment in which experiences appear!

But, yeah, there is a remarkable flexibility, and many ways to approach and describe the same thing. (The "sharing model" is, in fact, all concept no content, in the end.)

Reply to “Purpose in Life?...(i dont know)”

Go with the flow, because you can't know [things in advance]. Just do course corrections whenever you find yourself desiring something in particular.

> Alright, so im working at this job, and i belive that when im always focusing on the aspects of what i love, the Universe will present more Jobs with the aspects i love and ect, is that alright to do?

Sounds good to me.

On course-corrections: I mean that if you *do* find yourself is a spot you don't want to be in, then that's a good time to deliberately change course via some form of intentional act (LOA or similar). It sometimes happens that we might have a situation which isn't resolving itself, and so we specifically target that. As I say, you can't know everything in advance, because you can't know all the patterns that are contributing to your experience, so you have to deal with undesirable things when they appear, as they will occasionally do. Think of it like "debugging" yourself: it's only when an error appears visibly that we realise there's a tweak to be made.

> So kind of like gaining clarity right, to focus on what i do want!

Right. So in a way, it's like gradually coming to a better and better understanding of yourself. You notice the 'world behaviour' (which is really an extension of you) and go, um, that's not how I want to be, and then make the change.

Reply to “Limitations of LoA”

Basically, there are no inherent limits at all, structurally. However, I'd suggest that people who have moral scruples about doing certain things, will tend to receive a punishment according to their worldview, and that going around feeling angry and hateful, would tend to bring about an experience of an angry and hateful world.

People tend not to *want* to push things so far that they in effect won't be "here" anymore. Getting fantastical for a moment, say it was possible to learn to teleport small objects whenever you wanted. Be so great, right? But wait. Now think for second: would you *really want* to live in a world where that was now possible, truly?

Well, the trick here is you can't tell the difference between prediction and creation - just as when you look through a door, you can't tell whether the scene beyond was there already. What you *might* say, though, is that experiencing something (in senses or in thought) *defines* it, for all subsequent experiences.

The question becomes: provided I have not observed something completely to the contrary in my senses, can I cause my desired outcome to enter my experience via thought? In other words: can I create a "fake observation" and have the world behave as if it were true?

And the LOA and similar formulations respond: yes, you can.

However, even the more direct versions of this sort of thing *tend* to unfold by what seem to be "plausible if very unlikely" events. Because you are not a blank slate; you have accumulated and deepened many patterns or "facts" so far, and those limit what counts as "plausible". Actually, each defining observation could be described as the establishing of a new fact.

Think of what you'd have to undo in order to circumvent habits as deep as object persistence?

Aside - As for physical laws, they are not in themselves restrictive. They are not "rules of the universe", they are descriptions we have inferred from observations. Our observations dictate the possible "laws", the laws do not dictate the possible observations. Concepts are narrative fictions; they don't necessarily restrict anything other than our ability to conceive of things (although they don't necessarily make things possible either).

Reply to “What are the "limits" to the LOA?”

The restriction on asserting another person's experience doesn't necessarily restrict what you can have as *your own experience of them*; our experiences aren't necessarily happening "at the same time".

The underlying assumption to the argument is that "we are individual people in a shared, spatially-extended place unfolding in time" may well be false. This assumption arises, I suggest, from the idea that the *world-as-it-is* has the same "formatting" as our ongoing sensory experience. However, experiences with the "law of attraction" or other "intentions that disregard the usual worldview" tend to indicate this should not be taken for granted.

Experimenting with directly updating other people *can* bring results - but you need to view it in terms of updating *your* experience of *them*, rather than *their* (hypothetical) experience of *themselves*. "Free will" is a 1st-person concept; extending it to 3rd-person perspectives might be am error.

So, one approach would be to say that the world as it truly is, is structured in such a way that everyone can experience what they want as if they had their own "private copy" of the world. In other words, the world is not "simply-shared" like a *place*, it is "abstractly-shared" like a sort of *shared toolbox* of potential patterns.

Then, the sense in which "when someone enters your life, they are a lesson or a blessing" is that if you intend a particular outcome, then the path between "now" and "then" becomes defined at that moment, and inevitably contains events and encounters along the way which lead you from "here" to "there" - including people-based events.

For example, if you intended to be successful in a particular career, events and encounters might include: meeting a person at a party who knows about the industry (blessing: make contacts and learn facts about that business), meeting another person in a particular office who is nasty to you (lesson: how to handle the unpleasant side of that business environment in future), being involved in a car accident (blessing: made you contemplate life, stop procrastinating and get on with switching career), and so on.

Note: the "blessings" and "lessons" that arise are *not* of the form of "messages from the universe"; they happen simply because you've put a stake in the sand saying "this will happen", and the pattern of the world shifts at that moment to accommodate that fact. It's like having two poles in the sand representing two facts - the fact of how things are now, and the fact of this future situation - and there being a string between them, which winds its way around the dunes and any pre-existing poles. It is a "dumb patterning system" based around a landscape which can be sculpted by intention.

Reply to “Living in the Present...hard/help!!”

Lightly centre your attention in your *lower abdomen* rather than in your head area - or at least include it in your attention - and "move from there" when you move your body about. Meanwhile, treat intentions as "fire and forget". Spend a bit of time each day attending to what you want to have happen, imagining it as if you already have it, enjoying that feeling, with the intention that doing so *means-that* it is true - and other than that, just carry on with life normally, letting it happen as it wants, letting *things come to you*.

Reply to “I manifested the ladder in 1 Day :)”

> The power of coincidences!

Although, if you could create coincidences on demand, then that would be quite useful eh?

> Yes. Just like if I would have prayed for a higher power to have this happen.

Or perhaps more simply: you could identify yourself as that higher power, but interacting with the world from a different perspective than usual.

> They call those people arrogant. There's many different ways to look at it. In the end, it's all the same.

Do *you* think it's arrogant?

Remembering that the way that view is arrived at doesn't mean it's your *everyday personhood* that is powerful; your everyday personhood is a side-effect, a creation of that larger perspective. Some might say that the appeal to an independent higher power is a way to evade responsibility.

Reply to “I Did Not Climb The Ladder.”

The purpose of the exercise is to show you that if you summon an image into your mind and an act, it *will* be reflected in your life subsequently.

When you say "I will not climb the ladder" that *implies* the image of a ladder, the existence of a ladder in your future - triggering of a "ladder scenario" into experience without you challenging it - which you then don't climb. It's a clever way of preventing you questioning whether the ladder scenario itself will appear - because your focus is on the climbing-or-not. Creation by implication!

Next up: "I will not be frightened of the escapee lions..."

The more "basic" your approach to this, the better. Literally, just summon the thought in your mind (say, the visual image of your desire being in front of you with no further context) and leave it at that. The more detailed the thought is in terms of the mechanism, the more restricted its manifestation - because all those details become part of the requested experience.

A good way to view it is that **you are literally and directly manipulating the world** every time you pull up a thought and change it. In other words, *All Thoughts Are Facts*.

The version of this (the ladder approach) that I've used as a starter, and one I encourage other people to play with, is to create synchronicity involving owls. It's nice because they are a relatively simple pattern that is plausible, but also are not common in most people's everyday experience.

[...]

Ah, The Owls Of Eternity™

Regardless of everything, you should do a daily "playing dead" exercise for ten minutes:

- *Daily Releasing Exercise* - Every day spend ten minutes lying down on the floor and "playing dead", giving up control, surrendering completely to gravity, releasing your mind and body and especially attentional focus, letting them move however they want - to get used to what detaching is like. (It feels nice to do this anyway. Nothing to achieve, no aim other than allowing things to shift about as they please. The most relaxing thing you can ever do.)

You might like to read about *The Infinite Grid of All Possible Moments* and adopt that as your background metaphor for how you can shift from one experience to another, just to give you a feeling that everything is possible.

Then you're going to choose a scene that means that your ex is back in your life. You are going to avoid incorporating into that scene any path for how and why this happens. The idea is that by doing this you are *literally* inserting a scene into your world - just like inserting a frame into a movie-reel so that it will later be projected onto the screen. You don't need to worry about how the frame appears in the movie; the projection system is automatic and takes care of itself.

Get all relaxed somewhere and:

- *Suggested Scene* - You are in a coffee shop, relaxing on a stool with a warm drink in your hand, your [name of person] is beside you and you are beaming with happiness. You are talking about how great it is to be back in each other's lives. The scene is like a fully-immersive 3D multi-sensory thought. You

> don't need to "draw" it, you simply let it fill out naturally and let all the details come to you. Just by looking for a good scene it will appear in your mind.

You might want to read about *The Imagination Room* to give you some inspiration.

Owls - I often use them as an example when encouraging people to try and cause synchronicity, there's no meaning other than that. Looking it up now, I see they are traditionally associated with intuition and transition, which is good eh? Of course, *your* experiences of owls may be because *I* am using them as synchronistic patterns. ;-)

(I used to use other things, but I read a thought experiment using an owl and figured they are the perfect balance between not being super-strange, but still unusual.)

On the right track - Hmm. Being "on the right track" assumes there is some external path to follow, perhaps? Maybe best to just focus on what you actually want to experience, rather than attempting to create "signs" for yourself which you then reinterpret, because that's just adding another layer that you don't really need.

[...]

> [Q: I have a feeling that the detail is in the affirmation in this exercise. Constantly affirming "I won't climb a ladder" is a negative statement, but with no emotional attachment behind the statement there is no resistance, therefore allowing the opportunity to manifest itself in the easiest way possible... Starting today, I have started a new affirmation. I have changed it to "I will not gain £100 unexpected income".]

I feel that this probably won't work, at least not in such a basic form, although it depends on the actual detail you are ending up imagining. To expand:

- When you say "I will not climb the ladder" the focus is on the "not-climbing" and the ladder is created by implication. The phrase *presupposes* an encounter with a ladder. So you get a ladder but you don't get the climbing. **The negative did not actually generate a positive in this example.**

  You actually got exactly what you asked for: the experience of "not climbing a ladder".

- When you say "I will not gain £100 unexpected income" then the focus is on the "not getting" of £100, but you are not necessarily implying that an unexpected income will come into existence. The phrase doesn't presuppose an unexpected income in the way the previous phrase presupposes a ladder.

  If the first phrase had been "I will not encounter a ladder", you just wouldn't have encountered a ladder.

However, having said that, your actual intention matters here - the "feeling-knowing-meaning" attached to the affirmation. In other words, if you are saying the phrase with the definite intention that it means you will get £100, then that intention dictates the form of the pattern you are triggering.

The implicit declaration that "doing *this* means *that* will happen" is the what will actually shape the form of the resulting pattern.

You'll have to experiment for yourself of course and see how it is for you - but this stuff (in my experience) works in a far more basic and literal manner than that. Very like hypnosis, like you are hypnotising the world.

It's all about what appears in your mind when you say the statement or make the decision. You get *exactly* what appears in your mind. If you simply make a statement, it will become true in a no-frills way. If you create a mental scene, exactly that scene will appear in some form.

It's basically kinda stupid. Like you are literally drawing patterns onto the world and then encountering them later. And that's why it's good to let go of it once you've made the statement - because you tinker with the idea or rethink it, you end up overwriting it with the new thought.

On the ladder thing, then, you might ponder:

- Did you *really* choose to not climb the ladder? Did you *do* the deciding?
- Or did you "have the experience of deciding not to" - thereby exactly fulfilling the actual request you made, which was to have the experience "not climb a ladder". And just post-rationalised it.

One thing that comes up in hypnosis is that the subject comes up with all sorts of reasons and excuses about how they *could* have opted to disobey the instruction, but they *chose* to follow the instruction anyway. Random snippet from elsewhere:

> "Yet another similarity between dreaming and hypnosis is the odd phenomenon known as 'trance logic'. This has long been recognised as an important characteristic of the hypnotic state. It is typically defined as "an extreme tendency of subjects to rationalise any occurrence they experience, no matter how improbable or absurd it may be". In one example a subject in trance, who was told to close the window in a room that was uncomfortably warm, did so whilst explaining that the room was cold and draughty."

That's why it's (maybe) better to think of the LOA as being an indirect request to have a particular experience. When you intend to lift your arm and your arm moves, that is an indirect request to "have the experience of lifting your arm". You do not "do" the arm movement; you experience it. This stuff is the maximised, generalised version of that very same idea.

And that's why you have to be careful what you wish for - and if you change your mind, do it ahead of time because once the experience arises, it'll follow through by itself as it happens *to* you.

On the climbing or not climbing thing, you can get yourself in an awful tangle with that sort of self-guessing! :-) You might right now be able to imagine that different things *could* have happened, but only one thing *did* happen.

As I say, the *actual thing that was in mind* produces the final experience when you "get there". So, if there is was a little box named "Thursday" then you could keep editing the thought-content of that box right up until that moment arrived, at which point whatever thought was in that box would become your *3D-immersive experience* and would *happen to you*.

Unless you specifically asserted the new fact of "I will climb the ladder" then it wouldn't happen. Different people respond to negation in different ways. The appearance of the ladder was certain, the climbing-or-not would depend on (for example) which of these two images you'd generate to represent that idea:

- "Not climbing a ladder" = An image from the perspective of the bottom of the ladder, looking up and not moving.
- "Not climbing a ladder" = An image from the perspective of climbing up a ladder, with a red cross over the image and the word "no".

You can probably guess what the result of each of those would be. (Hint: in the second example you might find yourself climbing up a ladder which has some red paint on the steps, round at your ex's house, while she's telling you she won't help you carry the boxes down from the attic.)

Anyway, so I think you are right to say you don't have choices as such. You don't operate directly. What you do is, you edit the *facts-of-the-world* with your thinking - and encounter those facts as an experience when your "world-thought" gets to that location.

Don't think of "the universe" bringing things your way. Just think of it as directly editing the facts of the world - "this fact is true", "this will happen", and so on - and from that point all your observations of the world being consistent with those updated facts.

Yeah, it's great to have stimulating conversations about this stuff!

Reply to “Former sceptic needs your guidance!”

I'd maybe start with something super-basic, something you don't care too much about, like summoning some owls - and then take it from there. Just have fun with it, then narrow it down to more charged desires.

[...]

[Q: Hey, when I read your post it was clear you were not like the day to day skeptics, because you said "Now, if this shit actually works for some reason, it'd be unwise to just ignore it." You realize its too important to ignore if there is even a slight possibility that this just might work. Its like if there was even the slightest possibility that a magic lamp really existed, shouldn't you give it your one true best shot to find it and see if it works? And if you are disciplined like you say you are then you should not have too much difficulty getting this to wok, attaining your dreams and realizing your power. It would just take you slightly longer time to build up your faith. You also already understand that starting with something that your mind considers "big" is not a good first step.

> Your discipline is all you would need. Every day sit on a chair with your back straight five six times a day for five six minutes each time and visualize a goal - start with phones or laptops or houses or cars. Also visualize yourself to sleep and visualize for 30 odd seconds during the time you wake up. Then, throughout the day, keep the thought of your goal in the back of the mind, no need to see it in detail, just in the back of the mind. You might say these are the same strategies recommended in the book that didn't gel with you - The Power of Your Subconscious Mind, so I'll add one more thing. Do these visualizations in a "neutral" mindset. Meaning, dont add a lot of feeling and enthusiasm, infact treat the visualization like a breathing exercise, you are not wanting anything to happen, you are just visualizing for the sake of visualizing. Like checking out a magazine while waiting for someone. Continuing on like this for a few weeks or months if necessary, you will soon find yourself in possession of the thing you wanted. The actions and the situations and the events leading up to the manifestation of the goal would all come from the visualization. Since the events leading to the manifestation will happen in a very natural manner, your brain might start to wonder whether the manifestation really happened because of some law or whether it would have happened anyway. When such feelings arise, set a new goal and attain it in the same way and so on. Moving on like this you will discover your true power and realize that it is possible to attain anything you focus on for a prolonged period of time. One last thing I would add for people like you. Your attitude during this time should not be "lets see if this stuff works" but rather "I am gonna make this stuff works no matter what." You already realize that if this really works, then it should be grant you anything, health, wealth, relationships, money, houses cars travel lifestyle happiness etc etc. So **why not once and for all give it your best shot?**]

That was great in its presentation of the "one true shot" attitude. Especially this:

> > in fact treat the visualization like a breathing exercise; you are visualising for the sake of

I'm a strong proponent of viewing acts-with-intention as direct interactions with the world. If you move a pen from one side of your desk to the other, do you have to get all excited about it? No. In the same way, changing or inserting a new "fact" into the world is the same. It's a "dumb, mechanical" process. It's like pulling a level, or moving a dial to a different setting.

Visualisation seems to me to be basically a "fake observation" of a particular state - increasingly the prominence of a particular pattern so that it "shines through" into daily experience. The feeling and emotion *of that state*, does make it stronger. However, we're talking about the feeling and emotion *in and from* the state - it is not *about* the state.

Many people, when they hear that you should summon "the feeling of the wish fulfilled" interpret that to be how you feel *about* the process, rather than the literal creation of the feeling that would arise *from* its fulfilment. *From* or *with*, not *about*.

> [Q: Thats correct. Another way to look at it is there isn't really a one "true" feeling regarding any thing you want to attract. The Ferrari that one person would be super excited to attract would seem mundane to a billionaires child who grew up around Ferraris. You can dig further down the rabbit hole and might come to the conclusion that infact, not attaching a label of "big thing" to some thing makes it come even faster. BUT, if its no longer a big thing to you do you even want it? And if nothing is a big thing anymore then what do you really want now? Thats when you truly understand the LOA as a tool and earthly stuff such as materialism may not matter anymore. You may simply start to attract "happiness". Thats why I dont try to tell people that "money doesn't buy happiness". I'd much rather that they attract the money, understand that its a tool and move on to lead whatever is their version of a happy life. Once you know you can truly have be and do anything from the bottom of your heart, 100% rock-solid faith, something has changed within you, you are no longer the same person.]

Good observations. I think people worry, though, that "generating happiness" as a feeling will make them *sha-la-la* the world (fingers in ears), that they will be choosing to feel happy despite continuing rubbish circumstances. In short, faking themselves.

Of course, the reality is that "happiness" is a pattern which when activated will, by association, trigger all happiness-containing patterns into prominence. So without having to specify individual items and events, you are "manifesting" experiences that to you are happy ones for you - without having to be conscious of the specifics.

Reply to “What if someone is born with a disease? How is it possible to manifest that?”

> Q1: Remember this and never forget it "You don't need an answer to every question or knowledge there is to conceive and achieve understanding on."

> Q2: That is a true statement which actually is an important part of LoA. Some people say not to worry how it will manifest just to let it manifest

Or more specifically, I guess: **You do not need to understand your current state, in order to move to a desired state.** "Understanding" is just another experience. "Solving a problem", the same.

If you are reading a book you don't like, you don't *have* to finish it before you are allowed to shift your attention elsewhere. And that's what things like LOA really are: a shifting of attention, a "recalling" of a different state into experience.

Reply to “Is this how it works?”

> OP: Say I want to manifest a Kit Kat. And then I focus my thoughts on it and meditate on it and maybe pray/send a request to a higher power. I'm gonna need more info on how to manifest but this is just a question of how it works. Will my brother come home from the store and hand me a Kit Kat? Or will I know my brother is at the store and see the opportunity to ask him for the Kit Kat? Basically, do things fall into your lap, or do you find opportunities to work for them.

If you detach, both will happen but they're really the same thing: Your brother might show up with a Kit Kat, or you'll "feel moved" to look in the kitchen cupboard even though you're sure it's empty and there will be a Kit Kat there, or your brother might ring you to meet up to help with the shopping and he'll give you a Kit Kat to eat as you walk along the road together. The more detached you are the more directly what you want will just sort of be "superimposed" on what's happening.

It's like you've drawn a picture of a Kit Kat on a TV screen. When the TV image is busy you can't see it, but at a certain quiet moment where the image provides an appropriate space, the Kit Kat becomes obvious (it "manifests"). The more detached and relaxed you are, the "quieter" your TV screen is and the less competition there is between "images".

Reply to “When manifesting your current desires(?)”

> > Are you suppose to picture yourself in 3rd person of you already obtaining/having that desire in your imagination or are you suppose to picture yourself in first person few (pov)? Also what do you guys personally do third person or first, when manifesting?

You can do either but it's about the attachment of meaning to what you're doing. If you simply do the picturing and nothing else, then:

- ***1st-Person View*** - I'd call this an almost *mechanical* way of approaching things. By imagining things in the 1st person view, you are basically *deforming* your current world with a particular pattern - or *overlaying* a pattern upon it - in such a way as you will see corresponding reflections. That pattern will then "shine through" when an appropriate context arises.
- ***3rd-Person View*** - This is a more indirect version and depends more on the intention. If you simply imagine a body in the 3rd-person doing the stuff you like, then you will tend to have experiences of *literally seeing people doing that stuff* in a way that corresponds to the image.

In both these cases what you are doing is effectively imprinting imagery onto your conscious space (as it were) and then getting that imagery back.

The secret sauce for getting the most out of either method is the *intention* you have going in; the *declared meaning* you give it.

The first version usually gets some sort of synchronicity results regardless, just because you've "imprinted a pattern" onto your Imagination Room, as it were, and you'll get that pattern coming back to you - but it is more more efficient with the deliberate intention that "doing this *means that* I will have this experience".

In the second example, to get it to work properly at all it's *required* that you get the intention right. You *must* mentally declare that the imagery *means that* you will experience your desires - that the body represents you and the rest of it represents your desire happening. This is where LOA overlaps with traditional magick - where you *declare-that* objects represent other things, and perform an action which *means-that* something will happen. For instance, you have two glasses and one is filled with water. You *declare-that* the full glass *actually is* the world and that the empty glass *actually is* you. You *declare-that* the water *actually is* love and connection. You then pour the water from one glass to the other having with the intention that this *means-that* love and connection is coming your way. And so on. All of this stuff is, in my opinion, about using metaphors and meaning - and it works because your experience right now is just a 3D metaphor "about" a world (a world that doesn't exist other than being a metaphor "about" reality).

As pointed out elsewhere, by "visualising" we mean the *full multi-sensory 3D imagery* and not just the actual component.

> > So how often should one visualize before things start to appear in one's reality. Let's say I'm imagining me and my imaginary girlfriend doing fun things. It's probably not going to become a reality with me being at home all the time, right?

Once is potentially enough if you don't then overwrite it. But doing a daily visualisation "for fun" is a good idea.

As to when things happen, it's about when a context arises for it to shine through (metaphor below). People might call you up to do something; you might feel the urge to go somewhere on an errand; it might be a multi-step thing. Circumstances will arise such that gaps appear in which your opportunity becomes visible.

Remember: As soon as you've done that imagining, *it is there* - it is done and the "owl is on the screen" - unless you overwrite by imagining something else that is contradictory.

Owl & Screen Metaphor

You draw a picture of an owl on your TV screen. It is always there, but its visibility depends upon the rest of the imagery onscreen. When the dark scenes of the TV show switch to a bright white scene, suddenly the owl "appears" - it is "manifested". Now imagine an owl idea being dissolved "holographically" in the space around you, and replace the notion of dark/white scene with appropriate contexts. Having "drawn" the owl into the space, you go about your day. Mostly the owl isn't anywhere to be seen, but wherever an appropriate context arises then aspects of the owl idea shine through and are manifest: A man has an owl image on a t-shirt, the woman in the shop has massive eyes and eyebrows like feathers, a friend sends you an email about a lecture at the zoo highlighting the owl enclosure, a newspaper review of *Blade Runner* talks extensively about the mechanical owl in the interrogation scene, and so on.

> This is some good stuff here. How'd you come about these observations?

Too much thinking! ;-)

And then noting that experience has tendencies (e.g. synchronicity) which suggest reality is super-basic rather than complex.

Reply to “Addicted to being right?”

"I'd far rather be happy than right any day."

I mean, basically you are getting what you want, right? Eventually you'll get fed up of that, and want something else. You might *want to want* something else, but right now you don't *really* want it. Logic doesn't really come into this. So, let it play out.

When you *do* finally want to be different, however, then it's easy:

- You let *passing* thoughts that don't line up with what you want go past.
- You only *deliberately* think thoughts that corresponds to what you want.

Reply to “People attracting De*th (Paris Issue) Are they doing this to them selves?”

I think this area highlights why the concept of "attraction" isn't actually very helpful. While it provides a simple picture of there being things "out there" that you want, and them "moving towards you" depending on what you think (or how you manage yourself), the "attraction" metaphor doesn't really extend very well to other situations. Among other things, it implies a level of choosing and control and "deserving" which isn't really there.

An alternative might be to think of ourselves as being born with a pre-existing "landscape of events". You only experience a small piece of that landscape in your senses at a time as you travel across it, however the whole landscape is there in the background. "LoA" is the recognition that the landscape can be modified deliberately, even the parts you are not experiencing right now - in other words, that experiences are local but intentional change applies globally - plus a proposed method of doing so. However, this is all done "in the blind" because you can't experience something prior to experiencing it. The shape of the landscape is not your "fault", therefore. Although it might be *in consciousness*, it was not *consciously created*.

Reply to “kind of hate my degree. help please!”

Perhaps treat this as a challenge - you aren't enthused about your degree but *despite that* you are going to use it as a project for practicing your focus and intention. **Do it just for the win**, and revel in your ability to make it happen. Then, once done, you can start thinking about other things you might want to do.

Reply to “How do you know your beliefs are true?”

I suppose *all* "facts" could be said to be inferred from moment-by-moment experience plus the conceptual frameworks you have adopted.

The only thing that is directly or *fundamentally* true, is that you are having this experience right now. Anything *about* that experience is parallel construction in thought: a connective fiction. It is only *relatively* true, as part of the "castle in the sky" knowledge structure of which it is a part.

Strictly speaking then, we never experience the past, we only experience The Now. We occasionally have experiences "about" the past, but those also arise in The Now. Really, there *is* no past other than as an ongoing story we've created, which we use as a reference concept. We might say that the planet isn't actually any particular age at all and was never created, outside of our conceiving of such things - at least, it isn't those things *in the format that we can conceive of it*.

Coming back to down to earth (ahem), really there are different "pasts", and they are achieved by sleight of hand. For some groups of people "past" = "carbon dating + isotope model + structured timeline concept", whereas for others "past" = "residual patterns + unstructured event model". It's meaningless to ask which one is "right" or what to believe, because they are all wrong in a fundamental way - what matters is whether they are *useful* and in what contexts they are useful.

Alan Watts has a nice metaphor for this: the ship and its wake. Consider: Does the wake cause the ship, or does the ship cause the wake? What does the water represent in this metaphor?

Reply to “My biggest success and biggest problem with LOA...”

Let's just say up front that there's not much point in talking about what things were prior to your birth, and that it's meaningless to talk about someone "intending" something when they don't know what intention is (e.g. a child). So nothing is deserved and nothing is your fault, the good or the bad. The universe (or whatever you want to call it) is "stupid" in that sense. It is *you* who are the intelligence, and you can only apply that intelligence once you realise what's going on.

So, maybe imagine that at the point of birth there is a landscape, and our life is like our attention flowing across that landscape from one end to the other. We cannot know why the landscape starts off with the shape that it does - it happens "before" reason and logic. It just *is*, and our ongoing experience arises from it. Any ideas about us deserving this initial shape are just us trying to create a story to fill an explanatory gap that can never actually be filled.

What the "Law of Attraction" says, though, is that once you're aware of your situation, it is possible via "intention" to deliberately modify the shape of that landscape - and thereby change the content of our ongoing experience from what it would otherwise be. Responsibility starts at that point, and even then only for your *active intentions*. You cannot be responsible for every future as-yet-unseen contour.

I think the word "attraction" in LOA is often problematic, since it conjures up an image of objects and circumstances moving towards you across a space, like we're dealing with magnets and must maintain a particular orientation, and it implicitly suggests a notion of "deserving" and detailed control. I think it's probably better to view each instance of it as a *shifting of state*, an adjustment of one section of that landscape, with the rest of the surface being moved accordingly. That way, we can remain comfortable with the *inherent mystery* involved in this. We have inserted one experience into the landscape, sure, but that does not mean we have deliberately sculpted the rest of it. It is still the case that we won't know the contours until we get to them, because we cannot have the experience of something before experiencing it. It also emphasises that it's not about *maintenance* after the intention, it's about having the confidence to *not interfere* (or "re-intend").

Reply to “LOA ARMORY - a collection of our best thought experiments that propel us to a brighter path.”

> [OP: What I was imagining this thread to become is an awesome collection of thought experiments that direct us in a really positive way of thought. My explanation will become much more clear once I provide an example:
>
> I heard this from bit from a YouTube video some time ago, but here goes: Close your eyes and imagine you're in an infinitely white room (kinda like in the movie, Matrix). Now imagine a dragon and watch it circle over you. Imagine your dream car and smell the leather. Imagine a Kitten and pet it. Now imagine a blue orb that follows you around and makes you feel the way you did when you found out your crush likes you back. You bathe in that feeling for a while. Open your eyes and imagine that the orb is still around you and can come give you that feeling any time you imagine it up again.]

Hmm, the white room thing sounds a bit like the Imagination Room metaphor I've used. It is meant to describe how your ongoing experience is basically "solidified imagination" - just 3D sensory imagery floating inside a wide open conscious space (and that conscious is space is what "you" really are).

This means it's basically a *dream environment* you're dealing with - where the dream content includes your body sensations and your thoughts as well as the (apparently) external world. Your experiences are just a sum of all the different patterns you've imagined, plus (importantly) their implied meanings. For instance:

Basic Pattern Activation

If you just imagine a beach ball vividly, then you are activating the "beach ball pattern" in your dream space. Whenever an appropriate context arises where the "beach ball pattern" can shine through, you will see a beach ball. It might be an actual beach ball, or part of the related patterns - e.g. roundness, bright colours, sandcastles, salt water, outdoor games. All of the implied meanings are activated too. If you are more specific you can narrow down the pattern. For example, you imagine that you are playing with an actual beach ball on the beach. Then instead of just seeing beach balls, you will be creating that actual experience.

Patterning With Declaration

Instead of imagining the literal experience you want to have, you can instead *declare-that* the picture you create *means-that* a particular thing will happen. In this case, you imagine a beach ball but you *declare-that* imagining this beach ball *means-that* you will be given an actual beach ball. This actually amounts to the same process, but here you are taking advantage of the "autocompletion" aspects of patterning. Rather than trying to specify all the circumstances in an image, you are just saying "this is what I mean", and by doing so you activate the pattern associated with that meaning (in fact, the pattern *is* that meaning).

Note, you can also do this with actual objects. (See the example of the glasses of water.)

Combining for Dream Fun

You can bring those insights together and be more free-form than you might normally be.

For instance, you can hold out your right hand and imagine a shiny silver sphere appears in it. Feel the weight, see it glow. Your imagined object is *literally* in your hand, in that location in your dream space.

Mentally *declare-that* this is a special robot which takes commands and goes out into the world to make them happen.

Now, whisper your instructions to your spherical friend, perhaps imagining that pictures and sounds are being beamed straight from your head into the robot. Then, imagine him launching off into the distance, *knowing-that* what you've done *means-that* your wish will happen.

The Owls Of Eternity

So the essential thing is: The actual process is very basic, automatic and "mechanical" even, it's just that you've accumulated lots of patterns which make it look complex. Think of your world as a dream space. *Imagine-that* it responds to anything you create and declare mentally with in it. A favourite experiment to get people to do is to create owls: Just sit for a few moments and imagine vividly an owl in the space in front of you, and *declare-that* doing so *means-that* your life will be filled with owls from now on.

Then enjoy being invaded by "The Owls Of Eternity".

One interesting thing to note is that at first it'll just seem like you are noticing more owls in your environment, *then* you'll notice that owl-related events are actually coming *to* you - and finally you'll realise that you are having owl experiences that can only be explained by retroactive change... hence "Eternity". In effect you have *inserted new historical facts* into your world. Although really what you've done is change the "ongoing now" of your world such that *from that point on* you will have experiences "as if" the past had been different.

> [Q: This is something I just came up with but definitely inspired by another post I've read today. Try writing tomorrow night's diary entry, today. Recap on tomorrow's events as if they were today going into detail about events and how it made you feel. Try to put in as much detail into your writing as possible and relive the memories of today as you write them.]

Also, do the reverse: Each night, review the day just gone and "overwrite" anything you don't like with the preferred version of that situation. Stolen from Neville Goddard's *The Pruning Shears of Revision*:

> “If you take me seriously today, tonight do not let the sun descend upon any vexation of the day. Just look at it, don't deny it, don't duck it, look at it that you may prune it and then reshape it. Take the conversations with your friends today, were they pleasant, were they arguments, no matter what it is, were they negative?
>
> Then rewrite the script and just imagine the conversation to have taken place that now you are rewriting for the first time. And it will take place, for everything in your world that you behold, though it appears without, it is within, in your imagination.”

Reply to “What if it feels good to say "I'm not...."?”

> OP: Like "I'm not addicted, not unhealthy" and it feels good when you say it...will this raise your vibration or will the word "not" lower your vibration?

> Q: In order to be not addicted or not unhealthy the concepts of addiction and unhealthiness have to be internalized in order to negate them. Quick. Don't think of the color blue! Now what's the first color that comes to your mind? How about saying... I'm free. I'm clean. Sober. My body radiates health... Those feel good and you don't have to think of a negative to negate them.

Yes, but it depends on what the actual mental content is that is triggered by the phrase - the "shadow-sensory image" that arises dictates the form of the result. Manifestation is basically a "stupid" and mechanical process in this way. The colour example isn't necessarily a good one because of its lack of possible nuance.

Two possibilities for our hero's example:

- "I'm not unhealthy" = a sensory image of looking in the mirror and being so happy that everything's in great working order.
- "I'm not unhealthy" = a sensory image of being on the sofa, having trouble breathing, being overweight, and then a massive "X" over the image to indicate "not".

In the first case, you wake up one day, go to the bathroom and go, wow, I never really thought about it, but I've really kept myself in trim! In the second case, one day you find yourself vegging out on the sofa, stuffing donuts on your face, while wearing an old oversize Scotland t-shirt because it was the only thing that fitted.

Even *positive* statements can produce negative results if they trigger an inappropriate representation. For instance, if "I am wealthy" produces an image of you sitting on an elevated chair surrounded by poor people, you might find your life situation does change but not in quite the way you'd want it to...

Reply to “My Problem And Questions About LoA”

Some random passing thoughts:

Intention and Direction

You could put all the work in and never get better at golf or stand-up - if you didn't actually have the intention to get better. And that intention is basically a thought, a thought of being good at it, with that thought one day appearing as a stable experience. "Undirected" work does nothing unless it arises as part of such an intention-thought; and any work we do which doesn't arise from that, is just busy-ness.

You'd be better thinking of it as LOA (or whatever) increasing the contribution of that particular pattern into your life. It works in a "dumb" way. Your body and thoughts and the environment are all part of "the world", and movements in "the world" result from intention-thought. Whatever you imagine, the world (or rather your *experience* of the world) shifts in that direction. There's no intelligence behind it.

Arms and End-States

For example, if you pay attention to how you deliberately lift your arm, you'll find you do it by a feeling-thought. If you type a comment, you do similarly. In all cases, you intend the *end state* and allow the world to flow towards it. You don't (hopefully, although people do tend to try) control the intermediate states.

So, LOA is simply the same deal: specifying end-states (via imagination directly or indirectly) and allowing the world to shift towards them (hence detachment and letting go). The key insight is that there's no difference between the event of your arm moving and other apparently separate events. Given that you have to specify the end-state, that should give you an idea of its limits. You can't specify creative discovery in advance, for instance; that can only take place as part of the shift. So, you could specify a state where everyone congratulates you for an amazing round of gold, and then allow your play to arise spontaneously from then on, but you can't specify the actual route in advance. That's what practice becomes about: getting better at defining end-states (the hole, say) and detaching and allowing the world to shift to it by creative exploration (finding the natural path of your swing), and establishing efficient routes. The more you try to consciously control that part ("work it out"), or if you aren't focused on the end state, the harder that is.

Literal Change of State

A thought experiment: Sitting in the room you are in now, look around. Recognise this as being like a 3D-immersive multi-sensory thought which you have *taken on the shape of*. Now imagine that this room and your body fade away and are replaced by another scene, on a lovely island, and your body is feeling particularly healthy. You become that new experience instead.

If there were no other patterns in your world, no structure, then that would be that: you would now literally be on that island, feeling great.

However, you *have* accumulated all sorts of structural habits, not least the belief in an external world where things "happen" before they get to you. So instead of your experience shifting directly to this island end-state, it unfolds towards it in time, which will have been your implicit intention anyway. You will have plausible-seeming intermediate experiences about how you "get there" (although some of them may still be rather miraculous).

Which leads to a problem: because there is a time gap, there's lots of time for you to imagine other things that are counter to that end-state, and derail it. We start to believe that it won't happen and believe other things that are arising in our experience, and so on. We deviate from thinking that it is a dumb, mechanical process that must be persisted in and maintained, or at least not countered.

To wrap up, we might suggest:

- There is no difference between experiencing something in the senses and experiencing something in thought ("shadow-senses"), apart from the intensity. They are both observations of fact as far as "the world" is concerned, and vary only in their level of contribution.

(You may or may not find the post *The Patterning of Experience* and its links useful.)

> Q: Thank you for taking so much time out of your day to write that. I must say it seems as if you are a VERY smart person. I enjoyed every comment you made and read through them thoroughly. A quick question on "the end state." I love your example of an arm, but is that translatable into other assets of life. So for example if my end state for my comedy career would be selling out a 10,000 seat arena is that what I should be thinking about as my end state?

Very kind words - it's all a trick of formatting, I'm sure! Well, it gets all this stuff out of my head at least. :-)

Yes, the arm is translatable. One way to think about this is that you never "do" anything, all that happens is you "insert experiences into your future", allow your world to unfold, and later on they appear in your sensory world.

Allow me to ramble on this theme...

Timeline Thinking with Movie Frames

A useful approach is to think of a "timeline" consisting of individual "movie-frames" of experience, individual moments: Imagine the timeline runs from behind you (the past) to directly in front of you (the present) and beyond (the future). As time passes, a new "frame" becomes the present moment, it expands into a full 3D experience that surrounds you, falls behind you into the past, and then the next frame hits, and so on.

The important thing is that all the future and past frames are present right now; it's just that you can't see them because they are obscured by the closeness and brightness of the current moment. Currently, the frames ahead of you are filled in according the implications of your previous experiences and thoughts.

So, how does the "end state" approach apply here? Well, there are three general ways that your intention-imagination could operate on your future frames. I'm going to stick to my favourite example of "owls". You want to see more owls, how can you go about it?

1. *You imagine an owl as vividly as you can.* If you do this, then the pattern "seeing an owl" is applied over all future frames, and owls will appear whenever there is an appropriate context for them. You will find yourself glancing in a direction at the very moment an owl image there, etc.
2. *You imagine an owl in a particular situation.* If you do this, then you will experience a more specific event, slotted into a particular moment. You will find yourself being led through circumstances which lead you to that particular situation containing an owl. (=a "fixed frame" that can appear in any moment)

3. *You imagine an owl at a very specific time and place.* Here, you have completely specified the frame in which the owl will appear. Again, the rest of the frames will be automatically adjusted accordingly. (=a "fixed frame" that is located at a particular moment)

In each case, doing the imaginative exercise *immediately redefines the future*. In other words, just as with your arm motion, where you insert a frame of your arm being in a new position, you assert an end-state and then surrender and have "faith" - to *let your world unfold towards it without interference*.

Applications to Comedy Gold

So, hopefully this suggests a strategy for Superior Comedy Achievement.

Obviously in stand-up we don't want to control our act, we want to to come over spontaneous and we want to adjust and react to the audience.. We *want* creative discovery to occur, so no matter what, we probably don't want to create a fixed frame in depicting the gig itself.

General Gig Improvement - We *do* want to define the overall outcome, though: a successful gig, or at least a *valuable* gig which improves our act. So you want to come up with a state which represents that - and then completely let go during the gig itself, allowing the performance to "happen" to you.

One suggestion could be just fully create a "frame" where you are at the bar afterwards, feeling great about the gig and what you've learned from it, having people come up and say "thanks man, that was great, really original", and so on. Do this enough in advance, and then in the interim period allow synchronicity to help you write the material, following whatever intuitive clues and thoughts appear, even if they seem logically unlikely. (A friend asks to you help look after his brother's owls for the weekend while he's away, man how tedious, but I feel the tug of intuition, could it be owl-based comedy FTW? I'll go! etc)

Hitting the Big Time - Any scene at the start or end of a gig, look out over a massive audience while thinking "this is it!", or perhaps seeing yourself listed in an advert for a particular venue that would mean achievement to you or - any other particular "fixed frame" of experience that would mean to you that you had *already* succeeded.

> [Q: Thank you again. You have managed to bring more questions to me, but in a very positive way. You have made me believe in LoA much more than I did before I wrote this post. To the question: it seems a lot like LoA is focused on the future a lot. I am a firm believer, after reading The Power Of Now, in being grounded in the present moment. Can you still be grounded in the present moment but continue to create "frames" to help you manifest positive things in the future? Also, are you/have you tried stand up comedy? Your comment on it blew me away and I only think somebody who is experienced in that craft could have presented so elegantly.]

Yes, you can always stay grounded in the present moment. Being in the "now" isn't about only seeing what is around you in the senses (passing thoughts are just as much a part of "now" as anything else, just lower intensity) ; it's about deliberate action in the now and not being distracted.

So, all your "frames" past and future are actually present *now*. It is just that the *content* of "now" shifts - i.e. which frame is "brightest" changes. Inserting or updating a frame is an action *now* on frame which exists *now* - it's just that it's current contribution to your sensory experience is relatively small.

I think of it as a "world-pattern" - a static shape containing all the facts and experiences (all timeline frames) of your private copy of the world. The pattern is always here, now; one part is brighter; all of the facts and frames are available for update.

Short answer: The Power of Now is more about not drifting into unproductive thought and worry, rather than avoiding accessing past and future deliberately.

On the stand-up front: I've always been a big fan, and done some writing, but never partaken! One of the most under-appreciated arts I think, although it's getting more respect lately. I've done a lot of work on investigating acting, performance, spontaneity, movement, etc - so that's contributed to my take on things.

Grant Morrison, Magick & LoA

> I don't really know who this guy is, other than he rights comic books. But this is a video of him telling how he would write a story and the events would be reflected in his day to day life.

Grant Morrison, graphic novelist (he wrote *The Invisibles*) and self-proclaimed magician (he wrote *The Invisibles* as a "hypersigil"). He was a big proponent of chaos magick and the use of sigils.

Sort of LOA x 10.

Possible idea: The background "format" of your mind (current patterns you've absorbed) seems dictate what you perceive in the world around you (both thoughts which arise and external events which appear). Engaging in creative endeavours tends to alter that format particularly. Whatever the mechanism of that is, is hard to say. Probably it's about *meaning* and symbolism; the dream-like nature of everyday life.

His story reminds me a bit of Philip K Dick's essay *How to Build a Universe...*.

> I think of magic as using your intent to change reality. To me, that's the same as consciously using the law of attraction.

Right. And the same as moving your arm! It's the same mechanism underlying it all, from the mundane to the magnificent.

Reply to “I would like to get out of 'here'.. Any advice?”

Some thoughts, perhaps you'll find useful.

Priority 1: Give Yourself Some Time

I'd say the first thing to do is get yourself some breathing space, using a daily exercise (see bottom of page). You'll be tempted to think you need to get a grip, to keep control of yourself, but it's actually the opposite.

The important thing is to *release a hold of your attention* to allow it to open out and relax by itself. Thing of this as letting your nervous system "cool down". You don't *do* anything to achieve this; it's like allowing a scrunched up ball to open by itself.

By analogy: The opposite of clenching a fist isn't to hold your hand open, that's the same mistake in the other direction. The opposite is to *cease clenching* and *allow opening*.

This is a small amount of time, twice a day, where you let the world just do as it pleases, flow as it likes, and you give up responsibility for that time period. You'll like it. :-)

Priority 2: Treat Things Mechanically

Okay, the second thing is to not worry about trying to understand what's going on or how it works or any of that. You're not going to bother trying to control your feelings or your thoughts; they're just passing stuff. Do the exercise, and *one other thing:*

Every night before sleeping you are going to let go in the same way as the exercise, and then you're going to do something. But you're not going to bother about what happens as a result. It's mechanical. All that's required is that you do the thing, which is like asking for a "preview":

- Ask to feel how you'll feel when things are fantastic again.

And just let happen whatever happens. It comes or it doesn't. If you feel something rising up then allow it, that's just a bit of time-out for you to enjoy the feeling of what's coming down the road. If it doesn't, then you've not had your preview that night. But it's just a preview remember, the change is already there in the future coming at you anyway. Just by you having read this and knowing it.

The point of both these suggestions is to give yourself some time out to let things settle. You don't need to *do* anything for things to turn around other than embracing any ideas and opportunities that might occur to you (and they will); it's about giving yourself a break and getting out of the way.

Priority 3: Think About Your Ideal

Okay, that's the basics taken care of. You've now given yourself some time-out, you've asked to be reminded how you'll feel when things are turned around.

The last bit is, do you have an idea of what your ideal situation would be? Practicalities don't matter here, it's about knowing what it would be like. What you want to do is, maybe once a week, reserve some time to really mentally explore what you want. But explore it in terms of *how it would be when you are experiencing it*. Really immerse yourself in it and do it for the sheer enjoyment of exploring the experience and feelings of it.

It can be easy when we are in a "stuck" situation to not allow ourselves to creatively generate the ideas and directions that we'll be moving towards. Again, though, remember that this is being done just to get yourself rolling again - there's no "right" way and there's no pressure about it. This is for fun.

The actual "happening" of things will happen to and for you. Your responsibility is simply to give yourself a break, to let your mind explore attractive ideas, and to follow intuition if it arises.

Daily Releasing Exercise

• Twice a day, 10 minutes, lie down in the constructive rest position.

• Completely let go to gravity. Give up totally, play dead.

• If your body moves or thoughts come up, let them be. Just let them release without interference.

• If you find your attention becomes focused on something, the same: just let go of your attention. Give up, again.

• At the end of the session (don't worry about exact timing), decide to get up, but don't make any movement. Wait until your body moves by itself. This won't happen for a while, but during one session, it will.

• In general, resist the urge to interfere with your body and mind, to push it along. Settle back and let it run at its own pace.

Running on "fear fumes" is not much fun! But just giving up control a couple of times a day will work wonders (specifically: totally letting go of your attention). Once you're feeling a bit more grounded and spacious, *then* you can consider other steps.

You'll be fine! :-)

Reply to “I wrote this article which through logical reasoning explains WHY Law of Attraction works (what do you think?)”

One thing sticks out - that it assumes that our accumulation of "previous observations" persists. Just the use of the "path metaphor" implies that obviously.

Makes me think - Is there room in your description for events which arise *counter* to previous observations? Isn't the "narrowing fan" of possibilities a function of the metaphor, rather than reality? Is "plausibility" an attribute of the world, or is it a condition of the mind?

If we can imagine anything, and what we can imagine can become experience, then what is it that limits our ability to "step into" what we have conceived of and can it be overcome?

In terms of "counter to", what I'm playing with is the notion that our previous observations suggest to us what is plausible for future observations, and that this is what limits us - *limits what we will make happen* - rather than the world itself. (I'm using the word "observations" here to try and keep things as general as possible: both external events, passing thoughts and deliberate imaginings would all be "observations".)

What is plausible to us limits the set of experiences that we will allow ourselves to have - in terms of what we will choose to *intend*, and also in terms of what we will *let happen*.

So if I wanted to lose weight, I wouldn't intend to lose it in one week, and nor would I allow that to happen, because I "know" it doesn't. But more interestingly: if my brother had always hated alcohol and was allergic to it, I wouldn't intend or allow myself experiencing him showing up at my yacht party sharing out the champagne. Also, I wouldn't intend or allow his eyes to suddenly change from brown to green.

These things (his allergy, his eye colour) have become "facts" to me, even though those "facts" only belong to my thoughts and conclusions from observations, not to the world itself. So "plausibility" and the "narrowing fan" arise from what amounts to self-imposed limits for future experiences. We can't ever know what the limits of *the world* are (if indeed there are any), all we ever know is our personal limits which we've essentially made up. When such things do happen, we call them "coincidences" or "glitches" or "miracles", depending on the extent that they break our previous ideas about the world.

This means that *even the idea that we are on a path* is a limiting notion, that the world unfolds by a sequence of choices in a probability space, and that things can be "far away". The path concept is itself a conditioning of society and our own thinking. Now, that's not to say that anything *can* happen - but it does say that prior observations are no indication of what *could* happen. Prior observations are evidence of our own state of mind, rather than the state of the world.

I think that the notion of a life as a series of choices is not necessarily wrong, but may be *optional*.

I think this view arises from a particular notion of time as something that passes, something that happens to us, rather than (say) something we do. Perhaps instead time doesn't move forward through us; rather, we move our attention across a landscape of experiences. It's the difference between the "stream of consciousness" model and the "associative traversal" model of experience. And associative traversal operates by *logical connection* rather than causal sequencing. This is how we can *think ourselves* into the next moment.

When it comes to intending by visualising as "already achieved", what we are really doing is leaving the timescale up to our accumulated observational debris. We are deliberately omitting detail in our intention

such that this aspect "autocompletes". We are deliberately choosing not to challenge prior observations, *and this is why accumulated "implied facts" persist and limit us*.

Although we are doomed now to get into philosophy if we go to far on the next bit, it's inherent with the LOA that we are living in a somewhat "private view" of the world. The more you push it, the more obvious this becomes. What it eventually amounts to is:

- The only thing that is definitely true is that your experience arises as senses, perceptions, thoughts.

There is nothing solid behind it that you will ever experience or encounter - e.g. "sequencing your DNA" is just another thing you can experience, it doesn't *cause* anything as such. It itself is another *result*.

If you ask for (admittedly this is an extreme example but let's go with it) a change in your brother's eye colour, you are not really asking for DNA to change and history the be reformed. What you are asking for is: that from *this point onwards* you will have experiences (senses, perceptions, thoughts) that are *consistent with* your brother having green eyes. All requests are really of this form.

What you are calling "context" would correspond to my idea of accumulated observations. But whereas (as I understand it) you view context as a fixed foundation that is added to (like sedimentary layers, or a journey along a one-way path), something which has a level of "solidity" - a collection of observations has no such solidity. It can be revised or overcome because previous observations are not "buried" by later ones.

I think of this as a collection of superimposed patterns - like moire fringes. The current - apparently moving - experience is a summation of all contributing patterns, equivalent to all previous observations. Meanwhile, LOA intention and indeed everyday choices correspond to the inclusion/activation of an additional pattern. However, we can see that all prior patterns are still accessible. Meaning we can perhaps do more than simply *add* - we can *revise or remove*.

Yeah, it's a view I'm pretty keen on at the moment. Eventually it involves flipping round the orientation of experience, but it's much more truthful to actual experience and it leads to some useful approaches I think.

To continue...

Well, associative traversal is just a way of saying you "recall into existence" your experiences - as if there was a vast memory-block of all possibilities and you "think your way through it". It changes the perspective view from that of an external world, to one of an activity of mind. (Which of course makes sense for LOA.)

It's *slightly* Platonic but we have to be careful what we mean by "the world" now. In this conception, the world is *not* a "spatially-extended place unfolding in time". Instead of being a *shared environment* it is more like a *shared resource* of possible patterns which we can draw upon for our personal experiencing.

Rather than being a body and walking around in a world, what's happening is that we are a conscious perspective which is having a *being-a-person-in-a-world* experience.

Observations of the world are no more *inherently* restrictive and limiting for subsequent experiences than, say, a sequence of thought limits what you are able to think in the future. In fact, I'm going to make a suggestion here: the only difference between a world-experience (sensory) and a thought (shadow-sensory) is that the former is 3D-immersive and stable, whereas the latter is not.

This leads us to a useful formulation:

- The world is just a line of thought, albeit a bright and stable and immersive one.
- The world has no depth.

- Dissolved into the background space are all possible forms and relationships. It’s like a toy box filled with pre-made shapes and layouts, objects and containers.
- To bring them into worldly existence, we merely have to *recall* them.
- To recall them is to superimpose those patterns upon current experience. They are incorporated and “manifest” wherever context permits.
- The more specific we are with our recall, the more narrowly defined the context. (For instance, we might incorporate a timeframe or location or circumstance, and manifestation would be constrained appropriately.)
- An ’intention’ is simply the name for a pattern which we want to see incorporated into our life. The thought of the intention *is* that pattern and *is* its activation.
- We "recall things into existence", in effect.

So we might take this and use extreme examples to ponder it...

Okay, let's assume you are experiencing being sat in a room looking at a screen right now, reading this. Take a moment to recognise something important: although you tend to assume that you are a body in a situation, your direct experience is more like you are a "perceptual space" in which your experience of vision, sound, texture arises. If you *are* this space then the room around you is like a three-dimensional thought or imagining that you are "filled up" with.

Now, I want you to think about the room next door. For the sake of the example, let's assume this appears as a small mental image floating in front of you. Ask yourself:

- What's the difference between being in this room and being in the next room? In what sense is the next room actually "next door", if at all?
- If the thought of the other room were to become brighter, more stable, and "fill up" your perceptual space, surrounding and enveloping the region where your body sensations are, then how (if at all) would this differ from actually being there?
- If the next-door-thought persisted, would that mean you had teleported? Instant manifestation of "being next door"?
- Why exactly do we tend to have an experience of "walking from this room to the next room" rather than simply teleporting? Why do we have a passage-of-time experience before our desires manifest?

So hopefully the relationship to LOA type stuff is clear.

> How did you learn about this viewpoint

It just developed over time - via philosophical musings plus direct experimentation.

Don't let my take on things distract you though: all descriptions should be viewed as "active metaphors". They shape experience, sure, but experiential content itself should be seen as arbitrary. So find ones that appeal and use them.

Reply to “Law of Attraction: The Science of Attracting More of What You Want and Less of What You Don't”

> So how did you find out about the LoA?

I was interested in "the nature of reality" and all that sort of thing (science and philosophy but also imagination), then read about "chaos magick" and that stuff (things like Alan Chapman and Ramsay Dukes). So I see LOA as one version or approach from that group: reality-shifting, you might call it. Always been looking for better ways to think about the world, and to use it.

I was aware of *The Secret* but never really looked into it, because it sounded like a half-arsed version of something else, I figured. But then it seems to have got people interested in "this stuff" and that's a good thing.

Chaos magick has sigils and stuff but really *all* of this, I'd say, is about recognising that the world is "made from imagery" that has become stable, and so intention and imagery are how you redirect it from its current path (my attempt at a metaphor: *The Imagination Room*). It's about deliberately, wilfully creating synchronicity.

So it doesn't really matter what tool you use, I think, so long as you *thoroughly think* that doing "this" means "that" will happen. Because if everything is imagination made solid, then everything is a sort of idea or metaphor. (Alan Chapman makes that point in the opening of that book: decide that *this* means *that*, then do *this*, and you'll experience *that*.)

I guess it means: Follow the approach that you feel you can get behind most completely. The LOA is pretty good if you just get behind it with faith, but it doesn't have much of an explanation behind it for the details.

> would you mind telling me of any particular instance that really strikes you as "WOW!" that you created?

The first things I did were things like choosing which exam questions to study (exact results), and "undoing" things that happened (never mentioned again, *Ctrl-Z* magic!). More striking is just getting *patterns* to appear deliberately in your life, because it shows you that reality is far more straightforward in some ways than we assume.

Copy-pasted related post below, in case you want to experiment.

Fun With Owls

Anyway, so the fun thing to do is simply spend a few moments imagining (say) an owl in the space in front of you, as it would be there if you were seeing it (i.e. don't think *about* it but actually put "over there"), really feel it to be there, with the *firm intention* that more owls are going to fill your life. Decide that doing this imagining *means that* you will see more owls. And then see what happens.

At first, people *see more* owl imagery in their life and they think: hey, those owls were always there, I'm just noticing them more. But then *events* start happening that bring owls too them: that night, their girlfriend, knowing nothing about this, sends them a funny youtube video about owls. Hmm! Finally, they notice owl-related items in their homes or at work, which they kinda hadn't noticed before, but do have a memory of having been there. They start to wonder: was it *always* true that I bought this stuff a while back? Or has it only *become* true now?

It starts to look like the exercise has *updated all future experiences to incorporate owls where possible* - even existing situations and their memories.

You get the idea. So the simplicity of that and getting results gives an insight into how *automatic and mechanical* reality can be. You think there's a big world "out there" where stuff happens, but really it's just lots of patterns combining on a conscious screen that has no depth to it...

So not just "wow!" results but something which really breaks your idea of reality.

Owl & Screen Metaphor

You draw a picture of an owl on your TV screen. It is always there, but its visibility depends upon the rest of the imagery onscreen. When the dark scenes of the TV show switch to a bright white scene, suddenly the owl "appears" - it is "manifested".

Now imagine an owl *idea* being dissolved "holographically" in the space around you, and replace the notion of dark/white scene with appropriate contexts. Having "drawn" the owl into the space, you go about your day.

Mostly the owl isn't anywhere to be seen, but wherever an appropriate context arises then aspects of the owl idea shine through and are manifest: A man has an owl image on a t-shirt, the woman in the shop has massive eyes and eyebrows like feathers, a friend sends you an email about a lecture at the zoo highlighting the owl enclosure, a newspaper review of *Blade Runner* talks extensively about the mechanical owl in the interrogation scene, and so on.

> That is so interesting. Very similar to a lot of LoA stuff really.

Well, everything has to have the same basis, if you think about it. If there is a "how things are" then all the approaches that work must be come from the same insights, even if they have some extra layers on top which *seem* different!

Yeah, it's hard to phrase these things, isn't it? But if you keep it simple, all you ever have is an experience, and all you every desire is particular experiences. *Intending* (willing-deciding) shifts your experience, and *detachment* (letting-go-allowing) is what permits it to happen. On "letting go", well it's not something you can actually do. It's about something you *don't* do - you don't stand in the way of your current experience shifting into your desired experience. But still, how?

Think of it a little differently. Here's a couple of suggestions:

The Background Space and Not the Things

Whatever you are identified with, that's a bit of "ground of reality" that you are "standing on" and preventing it moving. So the real trick is to identify with parts of experience that don't move, so I suggest: Identify yourself with the *background space* in which your experience arises. Take a moment, and "feel out" into the room in all directions, and beyond. You'll find that you can actually feel out "forever". Now, imagine-decide that you *are* this background space, and all sensations, perceptions and thoughts are just bit of imagery floating in that space. By identifying with the background space, you are implicitly allowing the content of the space to shift more easily because you aren't "standing on it" by essentially thinking in terms of it.

Out of the Way and By Itself

If you think about something, you are essentially re-triggering or re-imagining it into your experience. This includes even the most simple things, and you can experiment with this easily.

Sit down on a simple chair. Now, *decide* to get up but don't do anything about it. Wait until your body moves by itself. This may take a while...

Here's the trick: If you think of your body at all during this, you will re-assert it's current position. When people get up normally, they first think of their body sitting (re-triggering sitting) and then try to overcome sitting by "doing", to get to standing. Instead, either switch your attention to the background space (delocalisation from your body) or focus on your forehead (withdrawing from the rest of your body). Try again: "imagine-decide" that your body will stand up. And wait. Until it moves by itself. This is how it all works.

The Form of the Decision

So it's worth talking about what is meant by "deciding" in detail:

- A decision is *the summoning of a sensory image* that corresponds to the desired state.[1]
- Since your experience is an "imagination space" anyway, by doing this you are basically *deforming* your space into that new shape. Provided you don't get in the way, your state will naturally shift to the new configuration.

Metaphor: It's like a sheet of material which has been pulled taut and a steel ball placed on it. The ball sinks in and the sheet takes on a shape accordingly. (The position of the ball is your holding a state; the sheet is your imagination space.) How to make a change?

Well, if you push your hand down in another location, the sheet will deform and the ball will roll towards it, settling into the new position and fixing the new state of your imagination space: the desired experience. However, if you push your hand down in the new location while also pushing down at the old one, then the ball won't transfer, you won't get a change of state, and it will merely have been a temporary fantasy...

Conclusion: Imagine & Imagine-That

Anyway, those are some ideas. As you can tell, I think one the most important things is to see everything as *imagined*. The world around you is just something that has been thought-about for so long that it's become a stable idea and your experience pop up in alignment with that. However, you are perfectly free to imagine new things and define them just by "deciding" their properties. The two sides to this are: "imagining" (create an object) and "imagining-that" (assign properties or facts to an object). For instance, if you were to take some time to *imagine* a glowing sphere and you *imagine-that* the sphere is a super-helpful robot who scans the city for people you'd be good friends with and then brings them into your life, then you have *literally* created such a thing and it will behave accordingly.

Where LOA maybe falls down a bit is that it's model is quite vague because it has the "imagine" aspect - with detachment/allowing - but it does have the concept of "imagine-that".

[1] In general this would be a 3D sensory image filling the space you are occupying, from a subjective point of view. For instance, if you want to be in the Galapagos Islands, you would temporarily "overwrite" your experience of this room with a shadow-sensory experience of that. However, as I mention in the final section, you can do this other ways too.

Well, it's a fun topic and... useful! Everyone starts each day somewhat in ELI5 mode though; that's what a spontaneous world is all about.

Mindfulness

> ...they seem slightly similar to mindfulness in the sense that you allow the situation to simply 'be' and no clawing at what 'is'.

Yes, mindfulness is definitely related.

Unfortunately, I think that "self-help" mindfulness is poorly presented sometimes as a shifting of attention onto different parts of the body and so on - implicitly viewing attention a bit like a "torch". In fact, attention is more like a "filter" and your aim should be to release it so that your "imagination space" is unconstrained.

After that, attending to something would be viewed as the content itself "brightening and expanding" in the space, rather than you trying to contract your space down to it. (If that makes sense.)

I think that sort of thing is getting better presented now though.

Examples

> Could you give an example on how to use this on, say, a somewhat tangible topic, such as relationships or money.

Well, now that you know you can treat your world as a big imagination space filled with imagined stuff, there are lots of ways. So for a good relationship, then.

In both cases, just relax and release control of yourself. Do not *make* the imagery come and you do not even need to imagine vividly. You stay relax and just ask and let whatever sensory stuff comes up, come up as you do this. (This means you are *accessing* the actual situation rather than *imposing* thought.)

- ***Indirect Fun**:* Like we did before, you can imagine an amazing robot that you send out to find the best partner and bring them to you.

  Or perhaps imagine that just behind the scenes of the world is an infinite grid that connects everyone, like strings, and you imagine that one of the strings lights up because on the other end is your perfect person. You tug on the string and it starts reeling towards you... you *know* that person is coming into your life.
- ***Direct Fun**:* This is more like we discussed earlier. Here, you simply imagine an immersive scene in which you are with a particular person who is fantastic, fully feeling and enjoying the situation, knowing that it means you've got what you want.
- ***Super-Simple**:* Simply issue a command, with full power and expansion felt behind it: I will meet a perfect person and have a great time.

In each case, what matters is that you *imagine-that* performing the action *means-that* your desired thing will happen. And *knowing-that* it is done, you can enjoy anticipating with confidence, or leave it be, or whatever. The only thing to avoid is second-guessing or half-redoing, because then you are doing the same thing again, with a different intention.

> Just by you saying this, it shows you're the real deal.

Why thanks! Personal experimentation is always the way, and that's how you discover what works for you. It encourages you to operate through *direct-experiencing* rather than *thinking-about*. (If someone selling something suggests otherwise, run a mile.)

> I have found that my issue is very much with letting go

The whole "letting go" thing is hard to grasp conceptually, definitely; it's something you understand through direct experience. If a person can't "manifest" standing up effortlessly, then they're going to struggle to understand how other changes can happen. (And think how much better daily life can be if your body is "flowing" rather than being dragged around?)

It takes a while to learn not to "do" not doing though. We tend to assume that the opposite of a clenched fist is to hold the hand open (say), but actually that's the same error in the other direction. The answer is to *cease* clenching and *intend* being open.

> Seeing how brilliant your understanding is, would I be correct in saying that you can pretty much manifest stuff consistently?

The ideas I've ended up with come from a great mix of getting what I want and also completely screwing up! :-) But I do seem to have become remarkably lucky over the years...

Actually, I was quite a tense person for a long time and didn't realise I was always getting what I wanted; I was very much about "doing" and had a habit of not noticing the opportunities. Another reason to detach: it improves awareness! :-) It can actually take courage to walk through the doors you create; having trust in yourself-as-the-world is an important development. My big lesson, certainly.

What I was really always interested in was "the nature of reality", what metaphors are, and things like what the "sharing model" of the world is - kinda independent of getting results, so in a funny way this stuff was a sort of side-show. Finding fun worldviews that people can use ("active metaphors"), and researching "discontinuities", is what I'm about at the moment.

Reply to “Crossover - Dimensional Jumping + LOA”

> Now LOA is a source of perspectives on jumping that isn't as...scifi or esoteric.

Ha, I have to say, I've always thought it was kinda the other way around! Although, I admit, superficially the concept of "dimensional jumping" seems science fiction, but in the context of that specific subreddit that's not quite how it is presented. (It's more like a model or pattern one can adopt, rather than an actual "how it works". There *is* no fundamental "how it works", it is suggested.)

> dimensional jumping is trying to re-invent the wheel, ignoring that the principles have been part of spiritual practices...

Although, I'd suggest that the *subreddit* isn't doing that, as such. The subreddit is about encouraging an examination of one's assumptions, by triggering experiences and contemplation, so that nothing is taken for granted. Even the concepts of "the world" and "reality" and "me" are suspect. The "dimensional jumping" part, then, is just a way into that, really - as the sidebar indicates, it's just one model amongst many. (Although this exploration - deliberately - takes the form of an ongoing conversations in the comments, rather than in the submissions and the subreddit setup.)

The "principles... of spiritual practices" are something to be explored, not accepted, I'd suggest. They all come from a particular culture, speak to a particular environment, the perspective of their time. There's nothing inherently special about them, in terms of their content. It's more about the "gap" they point to, the *context* of their descriptions, that's ultimately important. In a way, the wheel *has* to be continually reinvented, in order to keep it wheel-shaped!

> Jumping isn't as developed as the LOA practices.

That is to some extent deliberate, really, although I'd say the "patterning" model that underlies the suggested exercises is quite fully-developed. But of course, the models are intended to be adjacent descriptions ("parallel constructions in thought") and structures used for intentional shaping of experience, rather things which capture "how it is". It's about building a bridge between what can be conceived of, and what can be adopted as experience.

Because, "what is *really* real does not matter", as you say, if it is only temporary and can be imprinted upon, or *shape-shifted* by adopting a particular fact or pattern. Rather, having recognised the only thing that is *fundamentally* true (that is, the fact of the property of *being-aware*), all other facts are seen as *relatively* true only.

/r/NevilleGoddard/

Reply to “You need to actually read or listen to Neville”

> [Q: What many people tend to forget, is that there is nothing wrong with the law of attraction, because the Divine Law, in itself is based on the Law of attraction. This is how simple it is. There is no law of attraction on one side and Neville Goddard stuff on the other side. Whatever you think of, you attract (this is the law of attraction). You think of God as the only power in this world and you attract whatever God implies. You believe in the devil and that the world is going to the dogs and you are going to attract whatever that implies. So it is better to avoid talking down the Law of Attraction, because Divine law itself operates that way.]

It's not so much about "talking down" the Law of Attraction, though? It's more about highlighting that LoA employs a different set of metaphors as compared with Neville's writing, and how mixing those metaphors leads to confusion - or empty pronouncements that, while "inspirational", are essentially meaningless because they have no grounding beyond some sort of general optimism.

For sure, the truth of things is always the same - that's why it's "true"! - but that goes without saying, and is not the issue. There are different descriptive frameworks as a way into "the truth and how to use it", and talking about one (Neville) in terms of the other (LoA) tends to create an unhelpful muddle. Hence lots of questions that people are asking here essentially resolve into having Neville translated into LoA-speak, unhelpfully. Or worse: a question isn't asked, the LoA perspective is just assumed and then the contradictions argued about.

It's like walking into an impressionistic art class and asking everyone to explain their paintings purely in terms of optical physics (or vice versa), or assuming that they will. Ultimately they're still talking about "painting in practice and outcome", but there's a definite choice being made in *how* to approach it conceptually - “brush strokes” versus “light rays” - even if the desired *result* is similar. The experience of the final painting is the same, but we wouldn't say that the two perspectives are identical, nor that one perspective was "based on" the other.

Personally, I do think that LoA is a much more vague set of concepts, and that "attraction" is not a good metaphor for the basic fact of experience, since it implies a spatial and temporal aspect, a separation between "you" and "experience" and the notion of something "happening" in between. In contrast, Neville's approach to this - that creation is already done, that what you are is the context of that creation, and that to change experience you change your (impersonal) state to make some facts more prominent than others - manages to avoid that, while providing a tighter framework less prone to "inspirational" thinking. The different way the two frameworks handle the nature and operation of "visualisation", for example, highlights how much more complete, and therefore useful, Neville's approach to description is. Hence, maintaining the distinction between LoA and Neville as *parallel ways of conceptualising* the nature of experience (and the nature of *descriptions about* experience), is surely valid.

[...]

[MossyEyes: You don't need to *do* anything. **You are *already* doing it**. I AM isn't some sort of technique, it's one potential mental model of reality. But it is possible to be 'so close' to that final set of I AMs that you never notice all the rest of them.

Here's an exercise to try if you want: Just be yourself for a minute. Take a breath, settle down. You're not going for Stillness (the person you seem to be probably wouldn't let you anyway), just something relatively quiet.

Feel around for the 'boundaries' of who and what you seem to be. There may be a physical boundary, for example, at the edge of your body. There might be another boundary, maybe a little beyond that, where you think of your 'personal space' is. Your mind's boundary may be harder to nail down, but you'll find 'limits' to where you think it can go (for example, into someone else's mind). There might be other boundaries too. Feel them out, find them, put stakes in them with pretty little flags if you like.

Then smudge them out. One by one, smudge out the boundaries that separate you from your chair. That separate you from your mother or your father. That separate you from the galaxy. Until there is no 'you' and there is no 'universe'. There is only one thing: **I AM**.

Try it out. Maybe something cool will happen. If it doesn't, don't be discouraged. *All* boundaries are self-imposed and so all boundaries must be resolved, circumvented or risen above by yourself. What this 'feels' like or 'looks' like might be different based on your current localized point of perspective, but once you find it, the door is open. You can always shove it open and walk through again.

It's not metaphorical (any more than everything can be considered a metaphor from one perspective or another).

ANY and EVERY limit you encounter is self-defined and arbitrary.

While we conventionally think of ourselves as these little containers of u/mossyeyes or u/miscellaneousrose2, *those containers are not all that YOU are*. In fact, the *only* difference between u/mossyeyes and u/miscellaneousrose2 is that you *think there is one*. You don't have to believe me on this -- I recommend you try it out for yourself and see. If you're 'not ready' for the 'realization' that you're *already* everything, then stuff like NevilleGoddard will keep on working for you in whatever degree you think it ought to. But when you're ready, this will be here too.

The *first* Principle in the Kybalion is that ALL IS MIND.

"The truly wise...using Law against laws; the higher against the lower" -- if the first and foremost 'law' is that All Is Mind, then that means *there is no higher law*. The 'truly wise' know that through the power of their own minds, they are capable of anything. The Mind triumphs over *every* lower law. At no point is the quote above saying you can't change the world by changing the only thing that really matters -- *yourself*. In fact, if *all is mind*, then it seems pretty obvious that changing yourself is the *only* way to change the world, right?

Be careful about carelessly consuming and incorporating other world views into your own, particularly if they are applying new rules and restrictions. The 'principles' in the Kybalion are not absolute, just as nothing else you might read (here or elsewhere) is absolute. Don't treat this stuff like a golden cow just because it seems to describe *some* things in your experience.

Proceed first and always from a position of power and authority.

Nothing is 'necessary' to manifest. You're doing it right now.

Be cautious with words like 'necessary' or 'required' or 'need' as they signal that you're putting boundaries on your own power and your own capability.

Also consider (if you have a commitment to people existing outside yourself): The people that are routinely manifesting things probably don't need validation from a bunch of strangers on reddit. What reason do they have to post their success stories for you? Yeah, some excellent few are trying to help others, but you might be 'surprised' at **how many people are routinely leveraging this stuff and then *not talking about it***.

Then again, maybe not. Which world would you prefer to live in?]

/r/occult/

Reply to “Why should I give a damn?”

> [Q: God is an asshole based on what you read? Like what, the Old Testament? Lol
>
> You can accomplish blissful independence in this world, but it'll be an illusion. There is no place where you can achieve complete independence because the entire basis of our universe is interdependence, and there's nothing wrong with that.]

The problem is, you can't get away from "him", because it's not the Biblical God (as an "entity") you have to deal with. What you're stuck with, is realising you can never be independent because you are a fragment of the world: you are from it and made of it. To ask to be independent from it is like saying you want to be independent form oxygen and food and sunlight. ***It's what you're made from.***

In fact, it's worse than being a fragment of the world - eventually you realise that the world is sort of "inside you". Wanting to be independent of it is like wanting to scoop out your own lungs so you don't have to put up with that annoying "inhalation" sound anymore. Overall, you might find that it's better to examine your breathing technique instead.

Reply to “Mastering Enlightenment”

Do you think that, say, any strong magickal effort for personal gain is an increase in separation, and will therefore later be followed by some sort of re-integrating experience? Hence, you get a bit of leeway to get your random ego desires, but overall you better not stray too far from your path/flow, or it'll get painful in the future?

Brings to mind some recent reading:

> The concept of a chain of causality is unnecessary if it is replaced by the concept that God's will is all there is.
>
> When we realize that "we" have no control, there is a sense of freedom and energy because control is bondage even if we think "we" are the ones in control. This freedom brings with it the awareness of a power that is mysterious and profound, the power of Consciousness (God). Ironically, if "we" try to use that power, it disappears.
>
> This is a twist on the saying, "use it or lose it". Instead, it becomes, "if you try to use it, you will lose it". If "we" toy with the power of God, "we" will get burned by disappointment and disillusion, but when we realize that "we" have no control, the power of God, even though subtle, becomes awesomely apparent.
>
> *-- Stanley Sobottka: A Course in Consciousness*

Which I'm not entirely sure I agree with.

> > But I struggle with "The Monkey's Paw" fallacy in magick and I don't like it!

Me too. It's seems like something that arises from belief and a certain sense of original sin rather than a law of the universe.

Your symbolism view of desire is very appealing. All of experience is "symbolic" in some sense; that desire in itself can be other than part of ourselves is perhaps ridiculous. Whether all parts of ourselves are pulling in the same direction, for our future benefit, may be up for debate. I do think we have a trustworthy inner sense that can be referred to though. We "know" the path. So, the monkey paw effect is less about paying a penalty, than perhaps seeking certain outcomes that are not "holistic" in nature, or inappropriate in the way they are pursued. It may be that by "letting go to God" we get all we desire anyway, and it's the most efficient route. But that of course would require "faith". I don't think we generally suffer for choosing to be *inefficient* though. It just means a bit of a detour, and maybe a fun one at that.

Reply to “Who is God?”

Depends on which one. There is "God" and there is *God*. The quotes version is an egregore created by all our constant pleading and moaning, say. The italicised one is *all-that-is*, unbounded awareness, from which you and I and everything emerge. The former is part of the mind; the latter *is* Mind.

Reply to “Is a Creator necessary?”

There is "God" and there is *God* - ?

- "God" is an entity who can be called upon, one of many.
- ***God* is the universe itself**, the conscious space in which all experience arises, and is made from. He is not an entity, he is *first-cause*, the larger Self from which your 'self' appears, and is a fragment. You have no power other than the power of God, for you are he and he is you. You are moved by his Will, which is your True Will, although you can equally intend from the perspective of your self, against this, to a limited extent.

  [Q: /r/Pantheism much, yessss?]

More idealism, I'd say: Consciousness is fundamental; everything, all content, is patterns in and of consciousness. Rocks, having no complexity, are not *self-conscious*, but they are *made of* consciousness. Humans are also made of consciousness but, having complexity, are *self-conscious* because they can attend to concepts within themselves, including a concept of 'self'.

> It seems like you could take your use of "consciousness" and swap it out for "energy." If you've got an explanation for why the universe would have to be conscious, I'd be interested to hear it.

No, they can't be swapped. If at some point you want to move from the start of the universe to a person that can be aware of things, and have 'self' awareness, consciousness has to "emerge" somewhere. If the material of the universe is inherently conscious, then this isn't a problem. Note, this doesn't mean that everything is thinking! Rather, it means that a certain region is aware of the patterns within its boundary.

For instance, your nervous system is aware of the contents of your nervous system, including "thoughts" (shadow sensations), but cannot be aware of itself (as in, its own boundary). Self-consciousness for humans is: a feeling of being aware (this is inherent), and an awareness of a thought of oneself (which appears within the boundary).

The Metaphor of the Blanket

Imagine a blanket. The blanket is "aware". But laid out flat, there is just "openness", no structure, no *content* to be aware *of*. Now, the blanket folds itself, creases itself. The blanket is now aware *of* the structure within itself, relative to itself: one side of the fold relative to the other. It is in this sense that consciousness (or "awareness", to escape from some of the baggage attached to the c-word) is fundamental, and this is how it becomes "aware of" something, of content, formed from itself. The brain is a very complex area of blanket (whose pattern border marks the limit of our personal experience), which is part of a larger blanket (the universe). (An alternative metaphor is whirlpools in a stream: everything is made from water, whirlpools represents patterned regions such as brains which are aware of the structure within themselves.)

[...]

I'm pretty open minded! The problem is, that the personal experience of consciousness is hard to reconcile with the "emergent" view.

You end up with questions such as, where in the brain does consciousness begin and end, at what point does something get complex enough to be conscious, and so on. It's not an underlying force, or that sort of thing, but it needs to be a pre-existing property of some sort. Awareness is a better word than consciousness for this basic property though. I've not come up with anything better than this version of 'idealism + nonduality', so far.

Of course, these questions have been around for a long time!

Another way of thinking about it: Imagine that the blanket is made up from eyes. Laid flat, the eyes perceive nothing, the blanket is not aware of anything. The eyes are "aware", but not aware of anything. With the blanket having folds and creases, however, the eyes see the themselves; consciousness-of the pattern of the folds and self-consciousness can arise.

Yeah, I don't see this as being resolved any time soon.

Quite a few folk - physicist David Bohm for instance with his quantum potential, implicate order, and active information - go for something akin to a mind-like and matter-like combination of aspects. My take is that you don't need the matter aspect (and who's heard a decent definition of matter lately?) if you re-introduce it as a self-referencing pattern of the mind aspect.

> > Rocks and the like aren't self-aware or conscious exactly but they have a relationship to their surroundings that's relatively static so they can function effectively as a kind of memory.

That's a nice way to put it. I'd say that rocks are "static memory" or rather - since they do change - very slowly-changing memory. We, on the other hand, are "dynamic" or very fast-unfolding memory.

Constantly unfolding, changing patterns in a background - everything is its own memory.

> > The fact that we're conscious is definitely a byproduct of the nature of the world around us. You might think this sounds like the materialist perspective.

I agree with that. Materialism and idealism are basically the same thing, with a new level inserted at the base: consciousness or awareness as the basic no-thing "non-stuff" from which things ("actual-stuff") arise as patterns. That's it. Basically, it introduces a mind-aspect by saying that the mind-aspect is the basic reality; a matter-aspect follows as patterns within the mind-aspect, which subsequently at an advanced level leads to patterns which are aware of their own content patterns.

1. There is a background (like water).
2. Things we experience are patterns arising and unfolding in that background (like ripples).

As always, the important point is that the background when undisturbed isn't *conscious* - which people use to mean *conscious-of* - it is *consciousness*. It is only *conscious-of* when there is a pattern within itself. Like a rock. Or a brain.

Reply to “Help a soon-to-be Beginner?”

Perhaps you need to realise that Christianity itself is a magickal tradition. Much of the New Thought movement of the early 20th Century was based around an interpretation of the Bible as a reality/magickal manual (e.g. Neville Goddard). You can't push through things with willpower, rather you need to embrace them and include them within yourself, let them become part of your momentum. The reason you are so passionate about this is probably exactly *because* of this need to embrace and overcome your guilt.

You just need to push through. It's just conflict/resistance. Don't take it too seriously. Any step forward into a new world or a different way of doing things has this associated with it.

On your other question, the meaning of the word "sin" is to "miss the mark" - it's not "evil", it just means to not be at your best. And those passages do not mean quite what you think.

Each essentially says: there are behaviours which get in the way of getting in touch with your true path and nature (that is what "God" is), and because they obscure your deeper intuition (distracting your attention) you will not pick up on the directions and actions you should be following.

There is the notion of "True Will" which is essentially Your Nature and what you should really be doing. The warnings against mediums and manipulations is that they can turn you away from looking within, to your deeper knowledge.

"God" is your inner self, your true self, and the "Son" is that which arises in the world from this. That is why so much of magick is focused on inner exploration and clearing out perception.

There's nothing wrong with doing magick, therefore, but you might find that as time goes on you do more 'inner magick' and find that your life *flows* better and you don't feel the urge to try to directly influence the world around you. 'Passive magick' where you are open and synchronicities arise to help you along, and what happens to you is what you "really, really want", arising spontaneously from within you.

TL;DR: If you feel *drawn* to this, then pursue that. This 'inner momentum' is what you should be trusting. The scriptures are not saying what you think they are saying. Go for it.

Hey, that's great. The thing you did there, you'll find useful for dissolving all sorts of barriers.

The world is now yours!

Yep. So long as you are honest about how you feel before you push through it (faking yourself doesn't work).

When you know what to do, sometimes you've just got to get a hold of yourself and the world, and make it move along! :-)

"Yeah, but..."

It depends a bit on belief and intention. If you believe that "what goes around, comes around" then wrapped in the intention associated with your magickal act will be the idea that you should get hit by it. You will be effectively "wishing for that". You get what you think you deserve! There's that way of looking at it, and also the notion that "all of this is you", so by intending harm on an aspect of the world, you're basically directing harm towards yourself.

Magick can be viewed as ***the skill of generating desired experiences.***

If that is so, then you should really only work on generating positive experiences for yourself. Blockages, barriers - whether situations or people - should be allowed to fade or dissolve, or be turned into benefits, not be destroyed.

I wouldn't get too hung up on that. It's the *intention* behind the ritual that matters most, with filtering by your background beliefs / expectations of how things work.

The world happily gives you what you want, good or bad, it doesn't care. You don't need to watch your individual thoughts so much as take care with the "posture" you adopt. That should be expansive and positive.

And you should always question why your are trying to summon something.

Note, there are other ways to approach stuff besides formal ritual.

Every intentional act is an act of magick: If you drink your cup of coffee while saying "every sip of this coffee means my day will be luckier", then that is magick. Of course, most people drink their cup of coffee while intending... to drink their coffee.

Is there something specific you are trying to achieve

No don't worry. Recognise those thoughts and just let them pass, returning to what you are actually focusing on. Just keep coming back to your purpose.

Stray thoughts, like anything, are only a problem if you divert your energy to them and let them carry you away. This is no different to, say, if you are studying and you let the thought of going to watch TV instead carry you away!

Reply to “New to magickal practices; starting with meditation, trying to lucid dream, and sigils; just want to clarify something”

It's all just making a decision, and letting your mind or the world go there by itself.

If you set a problem, and don't resist movement and change, it'll gradually turn into the solution by itself. What is a 'desire' if not a 'problem', a tension that is to be [re]solved? The decision you make is largely about making a commitment to not resist the flow towards your goal. A decision *itself* is therefore always an act of intent and will. Effectively:

> "[This decision means] I will have a new car".

Although most people like to feel themselves "doing" something, so in effect offset the process by one level:

> "[This decision means] drawing this picture means I will have a new car".

Magick as described is mostly just theatre in experience. We do it because the actual active core of magick - intention or will or allowing or whatever, the release to and commitment to the flow of the world - cannot be experienced as an action.

That's not to say that this "theatre" isn't valuable or powerful. There are many reason why it can be beneficial, not least because ritual can give you a direct feeling of connection to "the source", consciousness, your true self, whatever - which helps commitment, resistance and faith somewhat.

Reply to “Trying the quarter experiment from Prometheus Rising with no success. Help!”

> This is highly dependent on people dropping change (and not bothering to pick it up).

From a "magickal" worldview, **the people dropping stuff is part of the intention and takes care of itself** (the plausible story for why the coin is there doesn't matter). From a "perception and attention" worldview, all you're doing is programming your attention to be on the lookout and spot what is already there.

Thing is, you can't tell the difference between the two.

[...]

> [OP: I try and meditate to minimize mental static. And then I try to visualize myself walking down the street, or through a parking lot, and noticing a silver glimmer. I imagine feeling very happy that I found one, and that this experiment was a success. For sigils, I just try to quiet the mind, and then I spend several minutes designing variations of a sigil until one "feels" right, all the while focusing on my intent. Then I cast a circle and burn the sigil, imagining that the flame, heat, and smoke have merged with the fabric of the universe.]

Curious: When you visualise yourself walking down the street, are you seeing you from outside, or are you looking out of your eyes?

Do you imagine *that* you are feeling happy, or do you actually *feel the happiness*?

When you are later walking about, are you deliberately keeping an eye out, checking if it's working, or have you let go and are allowing the world to "come to you"?

> [OP: I visualize myself from a third-person point of view. I try to actually feel the happiness to the best of my ability. I also am on the look out. I've been going on walks specifically for this experiment. You know, the whole "buy the ticket, take the ride" thing. I walk through parking lots to get various buildings, but other than that I very rarely walk on paved roads. And for the first part of the experiment RAW instructs to continue to visualize yourself finding quarter as you walk. So, that's what I've been trying to do.]

What you did is the natural instinct and you're spot on about generating the feeling. But you will have much better success if you think of it a bit differently: think of it as "programming an experience into the world". Like you were inserting future moments into the timeline of the universe. So, what experience are you wanting? Well, of walking along a path and seeing a coin and feeling excited and picking it up and enjoying the event. This experience will take place *in the 1st person*, so imagine it in the 1st person as if you were actually having the experience.

Another good practice is to summon the feeling of *knowing-for-certain* that something is going to happen. Doing this, you can let the experience come to you. It's a bit like the Neville Goddard approach of "summoning the feeling of the wish fulfilled" - producing the experience you're going to have internally so that it emerges externally. Focusing on producing the feeling in the 1st person is the important bit.

[...]

> So if a person is raped, it's because they believed it would happen?

He didn't say that, surely you know this? There's a difference between believing something *will* happen and believing that something is *possible* (or having beliefs that leave the door open to it happening).

OP is supposedly *intending* to find the quarter. If that intention doesn't work out, then according to the perspective of magick thaat's because didn't truly believe and expect - ie. *feel-know* - it would happen. Meanwhile, nobody (hopefully) *intends* to get raped. It is within the range of possible events of course - otherwise it would not happen at all, by definition - but it is not an actively-selected event. In other words, it is not the victim's fault.

What the commenter is getting at is that magick is about creating specific facts. So if something you are specifically targeting doesn't work out, it's because *you* failed to create the fact. It is *always* the mage's fault (if you go with this). The opposite of the situation in science:

> "In Science the theories are imperfect, and are constantly being revised. In Magic, however, they are perfect and untouchable. On the other hand, in Science it is assumed that the operator (ie the Scientist) is perfect whereas in Magic the operator is imperfect and himself in need of improvement."
>
> -- *SSOTBME: An Essay on Magic*, Ramsay Dukes

Sorry for the mini-rant but the whole "bad things happen because you made them happen" comes up now and again... :-)

His point was more subtle, I think. And if it wasn't, then it should have been - because the underlying idea doesn't say what you are suggesting it does: people are responsible for the bad things that happen to them.

I'm sure you wouldn't disagree, though, that people can - within the bounds of their knowledge - take action to minimise the probability of a bad thing happening?

> > Fine let me rephrase. If you get raped it's because you didn't believe you were rape proof. Believe hard enough and you are completely safe.

Is it your fault if you get shot by a gunman in the street, because you didn't wear a bullet proof vest?

Perhaps there *are* magickal approaches which can insulate you from particular events. Is it your "fault" if you don't know about them, or if you do don't enact them "just in case"? No.

"Fault" implies a direct causality between an action and inaction and a future event. That doesn't apply here. Not wearing a bullet-proof vest does not *cause* you to get shot; not adopting a particular belief does not *cause* you to get physically abused.

> > Btw science does not involve assuming a scientist is perfect, it's cute that you think that.

That's not what the quote is getting at. It's contrasting the two worldviews:

- Science is about refining a theory to match observations which are assumed to be observer-independent. In other words the operator is not, by his disposition, affecting the observation. If the results aren't as expected, it is the theory that is at fault (and needs to be amended). It's in this sense

that the operator, the scientist, is "perfect". His internal commitment is not seen as affecting the outcome.

- Magick, in contrast, is *all about* the operator and the extent to which he has adopted, aligned himself with, a particular theory. If the results aren't as expected, it is the operator's alignment that is at fault (and needs to be amended). His internal commitment *does* affect the outcome.

[Q: If the theories of magic were perfect, they would never change or have different methods.]

That's like saying that if the theory of Newtonian mechanics was perfect, every sports player would hit his target, 100% of the time. Now potentially, if a sportsman could align his mind perfectly to the structure of his body, then perhaps he could. Magick is like aligning your mind to a structure, a conceptual framework, you have *arbitrarily chosen*. You get to "choose your body" and then try and align with it.

In other words: The basis of magick is that it doesn't really have a *particular* causal framework underlying it, but if you are working with a specific framework, then you have to commit to it and abide by its (arbitrary) rules.

> You are just arrogant if you believe your way of thinking is perfect, and even more arrogant for assigning your attitude to science when science isn't the system claiming to be perfect.

I think I've cleared up the science thing, right? And thinking, or a conceptual framework, just is what it is. Perfect relative to what? If it gets results, then it is "right" within its context. It's not a personal thing; you can't be arrogant about such a self-evident principle - i.e. that what works, works, and if something doesn't work, you make a change. The difference between magick and science is, they have a different view about where that change needs to be made.

> People doing things to change their odds is not the same as saying that believing you are safe makes you safe.

"Changing your odds" is only a particular type of magick, one using a conceptual framework based on the idea of probabilities. This is quite a recent thing, when people tried to make it more "science-y" and minimise the "miraculous". Other forms of magick don't bind themselves to that sort of structure.

> It's not required or even recommended that you assume a person is perfect or that you are not affecting the experiment.

You don't seem to have understood what I said: here, "perfect" is meant in the sense of being a "perfect observer", whose attitudes don't interfere with the results. And physics, for instance, does indeed assume that the attitudes and beliefs of the operator has no effect on the outcome of an experiment. They are "perfect" in the same way we assume that a sphere is a "perfect sphere" and so on - "theoretically ideal". (Of course, we factor in the possibility of cognitive bias and so on, and are careful with our statistical methods, but that's a different issue. That's not direct influence via imagination, say.)

> That's what I mean by you running your ignorant fucking mouth like every other leach who bashes science because they think it's evil skepticism.

I'm not bashing science at all (I used to be in the business). It's a great way to build up observations of the most common stable habits of the world and connect them with concepts, to build theories which let us make reliable predictions and develop technologies.

I'm just describing its approach and contrasting it with the approach magick takes. The two things aren't in opposition; there's no competition. Physics, say, deals with "observable regularities", magick deals with the other stuff, both are a subset of human perception and thought (however that works).

> Keep defending him. You have proven that you run your mouth about shit you don't understand like every other brain dead privileged piece of shit.

That's not a very nice way to talk. Is that how you usually approach getting your point across? You've basically read into the comment what you wanted to read, so that you could go all emotional on some straw-man argument that nobody was making, revealing your ignorance of science, magick, logic and humanity along the way. A reasonable person, in your position, would PM him and apologise for their behaviour, and admit you were just venting. The alternative is that you *really are* like the person you are coming across as - which would be horrific if true, so I'm sure it isn't the case, right?

> "Physics" doesn't assume anything.

Of course it does. It has some fundamental assumptions - the main ones being "the world is made of parts" and "change occurs via direct interaction between parts" - and then layers of the stuff behind every experiment.

> Are you just going to make shit up to defend a guy who has a holocaust pun as a username?

I"m not defending the guy really, although I think your language is well out of order. This started because you trotted out the old "this viewpoint means that rape victims are to blame for their abuse" trope, when it really doesn't.

There is definitely a good discussion to be had on the underlying idea of "to what extent does belief influence experience, and in what way", but by jumping to an emotive and extreme position, you make that impossible.

> Yes this is who I am. Horrible I know. It's your fault for believing I would say those things.

That's a nice line! But it's more accurate to say: My worldview allows for the possibility of aggressive, sweary redditors to wind me up using straw-men arguments and confused reasoning. ;-)

Anyway, I gotta say that I think the word "belief" is misleading and pretty useless when talking about this stuff. The word "belief" in everyday life is used as if it means "when I think about it I kinda think this is true", whereas in magick it's more like "I *feel-know* this actually is true". It's a total certainty, a definite expectation, not an opinion or a viewpoint.

> [Q: That's an assumption possibly made by physicists and even then it's an over simplification. Physics itself makes no assumptions just like my shoe makes no assumptions. Funny how you people cherry pick from science while bashing and denouncing the entire field. You are defending him you fucing liar. Yes, what he said means that rape victims brought it on themselves. If beliefs can do anything and control everything, then it's their fault for not believing they can't be raped. It's a pretty simple connection. Oh being emotional makes this impossible, blame yourself for believing I would be emotional. I do agree with belief being a great tool but saying "why didn't you believe?" To a guy who is asking for advice is fucking bullshit and I think you know that. It's not a line, if you believe that beliefs control reality, than its your fault anything happens because you believed it. If that's not what you meant, then don't fucking defend him because that is what he said.]

Hi, I don't think this is going anywhere useful, although I think it could have (because you brought up a couple of interesting angles along the way, in among the abuse). I wasn't defending the guy really, it was the position I was defending. I see it's all got very messy while I've been away though! Let's just wrap it up now, yeah? **Take it easy.**

> [Q: Saying you didn't defend him doesn't make it so. You even insisted that he meant something smarter than what he said. What he said is the only reason a thing doesn't happen is because you didn't believe enough. Sorry about your cancer kid. Guess you didn't believe in a cure enough, your fault.]

I guess it's just my tough gig, always seeing the best in everyone! ;-)

Should we blame people when the placebo effect doesn't... have an effect?

> [Q: No, we shouldn't. That was my point, remember? I get that I crossed the line early on, but I don't care and I won't apologize for it this time. Sick of people doing things just as bad or worse and not getting the same reaction. There's a difference between belief effects reality and "the only reason you failed is you refused to believe" You can bash science without knowing what it is yet I'm a monster for hating a religion that leads people to murder cartoonists and girls for wanting to go to school. Yeah that seems fair. No this conversation never would have went anywhere because you're just another hypocrite who lacks any self awareness.]

My take on our commenter was that he was being flippant and jokey while you went straight into serious reactive mode with a pretty sweeping statement that misrepresents the idea behind this. Which quickly turned into some big exchange. After all, OP was about finding coins...

Anyway - how do you think it works? The relationship between belief and magick?

> > I didn't believe my first sigils would work yet I got some bizarre effects. Doesn't seem like that should happen if it was purely belief.

Right, that's why maybe "belief" isn't a great word for this. In this usage, it's actually more like "not getting in the way". It's probably become a bit confused because, if you really believe something then you won't obstruct it, and that is necessary for magick. But it isn't the belief that's *causing* the magick; it's just that believing means you don't interfere with the process by blocking it. But this is where another confusion comes in - because again, "believing" and "knowing" get mixed up as the name for that sensation. A further twist is that people confuse "believing" with their "intending".

> > If I had to guess why magic works, I think a trance state brings the person to a place where they can project a pure mental concept for the aether to latch onto or fall into the form of.

Yeah. I think of it as accessing the facts-of-the-world, which are always available if you quieten down, and making changes by intention. When you do that fully, you *know* that it's a fact.

Magick is better described, maybe: Intending an outcome = adjusting the "future facts" of the world = "knowing" the event will occur

(This being achieved while being in a state where your attention is deeper and expanded into the background of experience, rather than focussed on the present moment sensory experience.)

> I always tried putting myself in the present rather than the past or future...

I've been experimenting thinking about it a particular way, just as a metaphor to work with. (Actually there's two, this and another one based on updating "facts", but they're kinda the same.) See what you think: Think of your whole timeline, all moments, as already existing. It is always there, sort of dissolved into the background of the experience you're having now. The current experience is just one moment, sort of "unpacked into your senses". If you don't interfere at all, you'll experience one moment after the other, just as it is on the timeline. However, by applying *intention* you can change the contents of a particular moment.

If you make a change to the moment you are experiencing, you call it just "doing stuff". If you make a change to another moment, that's "magick". When you quieten down, you are getting more in touch with the full timeline. All intentions always have an effect on the entire timeline, but the more connected you are to the background timeline in the same way you experience the present, the stronger the effect will be, and the easier change will come. Beliefs which oppose the change, or any attempt to force an update, will get in the way of you intentions re-shaping the timeline contents.

Does that makes sense? The conclusion is then:

- The world is like a *memory*, a world timeline containing all moments.
- An experience is like *accessing* a particular moment with the attention and the senses.
- Magick is about updating a particular moment, at which point the whole world timeline falls into line.
- Importantly: Your *personal memory* can be different from the *world timeline*, because the world timeline cannot "remember" what it used to be like before it was updated.

  [Q: That's an interesting way to see it. Our perceptions seem just as flawed as our memories so it makes sense to kind of rework the time line to adjust things. Your practice sounds similar to how Dr . Manhattan perceives time. The future is in a sense already happening or happened but there are an infinite number of futures for every possible change made here in the present. Change the course of the puck slightly from the other end of the field rather than having to change it's path massively right before it hits the goal. I've been thinking of the future in a new way. I imagine a constantly changing potential future being massively effected by any choice made in the present. If you want to imagine yourself big and strong in the future, take working out seriously in the present. So many of us do the opposite. We lazily do the bare minimum at a job we hare while imagining a better future instead of working hard to make that future more likely.]

Interesting comparison with the Dr Manhattan view! And you're right it's similar (all possibilities are available). Hopefully doing this won't affect my skin colour...

I'm taking the approach these days that *any* metaphor can be used, because there is no genuine underlying solidity to experience, just patterns (albeit stable patterns that let us exist).

So apart from "editing moments of a timeline", I also view it as editing more general facts of the world. There's an old Philip K Dick short story called *The Electric Ant* where - SPOILERS - a guy discovers he has a 'reality tape' inside him which controls his experience. He edits the tape to see what happens. Which is a way of visualising what we are trying to do when using magick: edit the facts of experience.

> I imagine a constantly changing potential future being massively effected by any choice made in the present.

Right, like holding onto the end of a stick and making a slight movement, the other end swing widely; time's passage is a multiplier.

> So many of us do the opposite.

Yes, I think we fail to fully commit! You can't just do nothing. At the very least, you have to be focused. The focus can be more important than the actual action. (Even in general life, without intention activity doesn't built up to produce results.)

It's possible to generate amazing results which are just incredibly unlikely and without struggle, but you have to create a "reason" for them to happen. It is usually very hard for people to get strong effects if they haven't provided some route for the result to be "explained away".

That's where "coincidences" come in.

> ... the easiest path may involve tragedy.

Good point - I think you can have almost anything happen, but if you don't specify the route you can't tell the impact. Looping back: it can take *any* route you would accept as plausible. Which is why people add a "no harm" bit to their workings I guess.

> Fire is like a time virus that spreads through the physical world.

That's a really nice bit of imagery! It has time as a "thing" - an element and a pattern in its own right, rather than just a dimension - and so other "elements" can affect it. It's amazing how imagery like that is so much more vivid than most concepts or theories. There's something "alive" about seeing the world in those ways. (Which I think makes it quite a powerful thing in magick.)

> [Q: I agree. Saying "time is relative" held no meaning for me until I got a visual representation of time and space. I wonder about tempature. If fire is extreme time, does heat and cold affect time? Silly question I know, a cold clock probably moves like a warm one but cold tends to slow down particles while heat speeds them up and allows change to happen more quickly.]

Well, it's not so daft when you put it like that. If *time is change*, and change is identified by comparing one movement to another, then a hot clock really is faster than a slow one. What matters is which one you choose as your "standard time measure". Just like how the standard kilogram measure is *defined* as the mass of the international prototype. It's the relative mass as compared with this that matters in measurement, rather than the absolute mass of this object.

> [Q: I didn't know that about the kilogram, that's pretty weird. I guess I never tried sticking a clock in the freezer and leaving another one in the sun or anything but now I am curious. Who knows, I'm sure whoever first thought to try putting an atomic clock in space and keeping one on the ground was a completely nutty idea. If anything mine is less nuts because it doesn't require massive amounts of money and risk of human life. I would need an atomic clock though, or whatever it was.]

I think probably an atomic clock wouldn't be changed, because the effect it relies upon is below the level of "particles" - it depends on atoms decaying from one state to another, whereas temperature is (loosely)

movement of atoms as a whole. But as a way of illustrating the point, having two mechanical clocks or watches, synchronising them, and putting one in a (dry) freezer and the other somewhere warm - and then the are different times one hour later, is its own type of crazy. If someone from "olden times" saw that, they would think it was magic and that one had lost time or whatever. Like the (probably) urban myth about people rioting when Britain did its calendar switch in the 1700s.

I suppose a broader point is that *you* are your standard measure of things that happen. You experience things by comparing them to yourself (your own sense of time, hot, cold, all that - even moods or emotions). Which is a bit like George Berkeley's idealism where everything appears in your mind and so is relative to it.

> That's an interesting point. The whole idea of personal perception of time is a whole new field of possibility.

Right, we think about time theoretically and discuss it, but we tend to not really ponder it as an experience. I actually think that the 'little theories' we adopt about things, intentionally or not, do directly influence our perception. Which is really a form of magick of course - adopting a new way of thinking about things, and then seeing that it changes your daily life.

Reply to “Sigil and Law of Attraction Contradiction?”

Okay, but... doesn't this whole thing depend on your world-view also? Even if the sigil is apparently shown only to "you", it's effectively shown to "the universe". The whole thing moves towards your goal, including your body. The main thing about releasing is to let yourself be moved rather than staying in the "problem state".

The shooting metaphor doesn't work for magick, surely?

This is not so consensus bound; personal facts take priority. Sigils and LOA do not operate at that consensus level; they are effectively excuses for allowing things to happen "as if". The more you experiment, the clearer this gets. What you "imagine that" things are like is what counts.

However you think that it works, That's how it works.

If you "imagine that" the world works according to the number of views an intention gets, that's what'll happen. If you "imagine that" forgetting your sigil is important, then even a brief recall or a glance might stop things right there - while those who don't care or haven't thought about it so deeply, won't have a problem.

An extra issue is that all the associations with a viewpoint also come into effect. If you "summon Hercules" to do your bidding, his great strength comes to your aid. However, Hercules had his issues in myth, and those will start to manifest too, even though you didn't explicitly consider them. This where it gets tricky and goes beyond what you *thought* you asked for.

I reckon it is impossible to fully specify or constrain things unless you create your own, clean metaphor/mechanism. (Or meta-metaphor.)

> Really describing any action is describing Magick

I agree with this. The shift from one experience to another in alignment with "the format of one's mind", including intention, is a description that can be applied to everything.

> While from your POV you may seem independent in everything you do the reality is that we all move with each-others blessing

I don't agree with the "simple sharing" model of reality though. As a "conscious perspective", all possible experiences are available enfolded within me. Similarly for you. However, this is not a straightforward dream. Sometimes we might think of reality as a shared dream with other people in a room, each of whom have contributed to the final, consensus decor. However, I reckon it's more accurate to say that *those who have chosen the same decor, end up in the same room*.

Finally, it's even *more* accurate to say: Whatever decor you choose, you will end up experiencing a room with that decor, plus versions/aspects of others who would choose that decor, as a version of yourself who would choose that decor.

> the metaphor of shooting me in the face does work for magick

The above means that I can shoot you in the face (politely, of course) and have you die, while you dodge the bullet and live. Subsequently: Different rooms, different decor.

Fundamentally, this is because you are not a person, and neither is anyone else. The "being-a-person" sensation is just part of the present moment world-experience. You are in fact a perspective, attached to a viewport amongst infinite viewports, selected by the "filter" of belief, expectation, knowledge and intention.

TL;DR: Blessing not required.

I say we don't need blessing because it's (implicitly) multidimensional enough in that everyone gets to have their experience. *Not* in the sense of actual spatially-extended universes though; *only* in the sense of filtered possible moments. But then, that's basically the ultimate blessing.

(The room is tesseract-shaped, and we are distributed clouds throughout it? Nah, too messy sounding.)

True connections with people occur when their filters correspond, as it were - they are literally "in the moment", together.

I don't have a conception of God as external, but the DNA idea could maybe be translated into the idea of a "format" that implies which events will be experienced - via the personal God of imagination...

Loosely, I think of myself as a boundless aware space. (Everyone is this, simultaneously.) Within that, is dissolved all possible moments and experiences *already created*. My ongoing 1st-person sensory experience is simply my attention shifting across this eternal structure, in accordance with my intention and beliefs. Foolishly, I confuse "myself" with the content of the experience, when in fact I am the background in which it arises.

Gives us:

- Magick is changing the trajectory discontinuously in unlikely ways, by tuning into other moments via imagination. We are always doing this, but deliberate magick makes it more obvious because we are deliberately aware.
- God is the whole, the open attention in contrast to our usual narrowed, time-focused attention. God is not a being.
- When we say that God intervenes, we really just mean when outlier actions or events are selected which we didn't have a sensory experience of choosing prior to their appearing. The "feeling" that goes with this is the opening out of attention, to the background unity.

So all events are "archived" in the sense that they are all, permanently available for experiencing? Creation is already complete, you are just choosing which parts to check out!

Not sure how to join together the two ideas of God.

> > By saying 'a god' I am just talking about an entity that has a greater range of data intake and influence

Right - I see that as just ourselves, the outer reaches of our attentional focus. We are always everywhere, we are just concentrating on somewhere in particular.

> Mostly I'm asking when this construct is animated; if in our life-time do you expect this will change your spirituality? Will you increase your own intelligence or try to keep a level of "purity"

I think this 'construct' is already animated. The construct is just the universe as it is. It's a case of doing or being this knowingly. 'Purity' would then be a choice to remain human-focused, ignorant of the larger information field (or whatever). I'm all for expansion - but as I said before, different people can do different things, and not necessarily interfere with the other.

> ... the FACT that it will happen

This is exactly it. Ignore the evidence, know the fact. Everything else is theatre. All that matters is that you fully accept the fact that something is going to happen. All these methods are about sneakily inserting or adjusting *facts-of-the-world*.

It all works this way, I think: If you move your arm right now, you don't do it directly. You request/insert the experience into your timeline (you might say), the fact that "it is *now* true that my arm *will* move". The proximity in terms of space and time makes you think that you did it by more straightforward means.

In fact (heh), you simply don't have direct access to sensory experience at all; you adjust facts, and subsequent sensory experience arises spontaneously and consistently with those facts.

So it's about creating new *facts-of-the-world* by any means you like. Since acceptance of its truth is what matters, anything that implies it is a fact (e.g. getting excited, looking forward to it) can only help establish it. It's a bit like Erickson hypnosis in this way - thinking and doing things that *assume* the certainty of the wish fulfilled.

TL;DR: Creation of facts by acceptance and implication.

One thought: that our personal boundaries are "imaginary", that at some point we create filters which give us a personal space. Without them, we are wide open to all information being leaked/broadcast. Perhaps this is what's going on. Normally, children learn they "aren't meant to" experience these things, and by implication don't, but these guys missed the memo.

I used to find being in open plan offices really difficult, even small ones. Just a constant sense of "exposure". Not vigilance or self-consciousness, just being too open. Over time, my awareness would contract further and tension would increase. My "little trick" to get around this was to feel-imagine a shell around me, a Faraday Cage for others' "presence". This imaginary "fact" was enough to make it better.

EDIT: I hear "sound effects" when I see movement, in real life or in gifs, etc. I only recently found out that this is a thing too.

Reply to “delivered from the lust of result”

> Maybe that's what the mind is, our infinite void where anything can be created.

Well, you've nailed that I think. Our mind is the void in which everything appears, and is immediate creativity itself - *if* we detach and allow our accumulated patterns to settle and shift. If we are holding on to "parts of the dream", though, then our creativity is compromised by or funnelled through those parts.

Makes sense to me (we have a tendency to fill our creative 'First Cause' void with surrogates which we give our power to).

[...]

For sure, I don't mean we can just do anything on a whim. I was more thinking that the idea of it being *probabilities* might be restrictive. I've been thinking more in terms of *plausibilities* - something that might actually be more flexible (and helps us get rid of worries about retro-causality, etc). Of course, that's just more words really.

> Doesn't that mean the same thing? Probability is a specific measurement of plausibility I believe.

The distinction for me would be:

- *Probability* implies that experience is bound by a separate external world with rules which are independent of us. What we experience is dictated by the "world's formatting".
- *Plausibility* implies that experience is bound by the *stories* about a hypothesised external world - what stories we find acceptable. The rules are *part* of us. What we experience is dictated by our "human formatting".

As an idea, I think the second version makes it easier to envisage how magick works as part of our minds. For instance, if you're playing with synchronicity, not only will you "notice" more of the object or pattern you have in mind, you will also encounter events which "come to you". Those events will seem to have their seeds in events that predate your intention. Probabilities don't easily account for that. Plausibilities do so more easily (*anything* can happen so long as you've not yet observed something that means it *shouldn't* happen).

> I would see it as an accurate and a helpful thing to say that it's easier to change something with probability on your side.

Hmm, my feeling is that it doesn't say anything, other than "we can't do miracles", and doesn't help, because it doesn't suggest a particular approach. It's maybe more honest to call this plausibility than probability - since the probability (being a mathematical notion) implies a measurement and an adjustment, but it isn't actually measurable and the adjustment detectible. What we really mean is "seems unlikely"? But we're just talking about a language preference here. Really, I was just wondering aloud whether choosing the concept of probability vs another might influence one's magick!

> You are trying to apply what he said to synchronicity which has absolutely nothing to do with causing change.

Intentional synchronicity is *exactly* how we cause change (or one way). But I didn't preamble this, so fair enough! To be clearer what I mean by that: Focusing upon a particular conceptual pattern, results in that pattern subsequently appearing in external and internal experience. Something I've been playing with.

[...]

> Seeing a thing a certain way and it being that way has nothing to do with the probability thing. at least that's how I saw it.

The way I was viewing it was: Seeing things *as* governed by probability, means you are indirectly *willing* it to behave that way - as a general worldview? Adopting that outlook is a piece of magick all of its own. If you view magick as being about probabilities, then your magick will go along those lines. If you view it as being about energy, the same. And so on.

> He's establishing realistic expectations rather than woo and fluff, however inspiring it may seem at the time.

Perfectly reasonable. I say: everyone must experiment for themselves to find out what is possible. One caution though: Your expectations in magick (about what is possible, about how it works) plays a large role in defining what you can do. It's not like science, where there's a "how it works" and you discover the rules and leverage them. There is nothing "behind" magick.

But that's not to say you'll be flying around the place by flapping your arms any time soon. It might well be possible, but you'll probably have to do an awful lot of work to establish that "habit".

There's an old story about a student coming to a master and saying "Finally, after 40 years of study I can walk across the river unaided!". To which the master says, "What a waste of a life, you could have saved a lot of time by paying a penny for the ferry like everyone else!"

Who knows what we could do if we dedicated ourselves to it? But: who really wants to do that?

> I think he's just saying don't expect magic lottery winnings and that using magic to influence business may be a better idea more prone to success.

I think he is of that view. I personally think that magick can be far more direct than he suggests. It (that view) is just another metaphor, after all. But that sounds like I'm dissing his take - not at all. It's been very successful for lots of people, and the fact that people can easily get behind it - it makes sort of rational sense to them - is part of its power at a metaphor.

[...]

I'm just wondering about how adopting a way of looking at things changes how we operate.

> The laws of physics do not simply exist because we believe in it. Try to understand that our laws of physics were discovered, not enforced.

Ah, I'm *not* saying that *believing* things causes them. I'm saying that the "laws" of experience should be viewed as *habits* - ingrained patterns that have become established over time. So they are not how it really, really works in some deeper, given sense. Gravity, for instance, is a *very* ingrained habit of the universe.

(The word "law" in physics does not mean something that is laid down; it means something like "observed regularity".)

Where *belief* comes in, is that is dictates what directions we will apply our effort with full commitment. Carroll phrases it as "your subconscious resistance to doing magic". It's more that *non-belief* - or adopting a worldview which says something can't happen - has a negative effect.

> You can't say anything is possible but you won't fly by flapping your arms.

Let's be clearer: Anything is possible *in principle* but it is up to people to find out what they can accomplish *in practice*. Certainly, my experience of flapping my arms into flight is quite... limited. Again, I am *not* claiming that believing makes things happen. I'm with Carroll in saying that *non-belief* gets in the way.

> You don't think probability affects it? So your magic always works directly?

Magick always operates directly, yes. Let me lay it out, how I think it works:

- Over time, patterns become more and more established in the universe. You might call these "habits". This includes things like gravity, the structure of your body - the way things work by default.
- Magick is just everyday intention really. *Intending something* *is** the magick.* Whenever we intend something, that intention *always* comes about in some form, funnelled through the current patterns. e.g. We intend to move go to the door, our bodies walk there; typically we don't teleport.
- In other words, the "habits" of the world imply the most likely routes that intention will manifest along, and restrict the types of manifestation. For instance, you will often see other aspects of your intention appear in images in daily life, dreams, conversations, symbolic representations, and then as an event. The restrictions aren't because things aren't possible, they are because deeper habits or channels exist.
- The difference between what we call "magick" and everyday intention is that in magick we realise the situation (that all intentions manifest, that laws are not actually fixed rules), and therefore intend things that are against common sense. The more directly we *will* this, the more focused the result.

In summary, what you are calling "probability" is just a way of saying something is unlikely. It isn't forbidden or impossible. But that's hardly helpful.

> Either the world is your personal dream or it isnt.

I never understood the idea that just because the world is a dream, you should be able to just "flap your arms and fly". After all, can you just think of, say, a tree in absolute detail right now? Most people can't - but your imagination really *is* your personal dream. You can get better at it though. Meanwhile, in llucid dreams, people find they sometimes can't fly. Why not?

My answer: because as described above, manifestation is about implied patterns, not about direct creation.

This is just "a dream". But it is "a dream *that*". A dream *that* you are in this world, organised this way - in the same way as we can lucid dream a persistent realm. Different dreams have different levels of organisation, of habit. They all obey the basic rule (intention always manifests *in some way*) though.

What if, in a dream, you intended that there was gravity and that gravity was always unbreakable? If afterwards you couldn't fly, would you complain that it wasn't actually a dream after all?

> Physics in dreams is never that consistent.

If you experiment with creating persistent realms (as described by Hyu in his post), then it is. When you just fall asleep and end up in a dream, then it tends to be somewhat breakable because you didn't intend any rules. You can experiment with this: In a lucid dream, create a door and go through it with the intention that you will enter a stable realm and you will. You'll discover its physics is not breakable just by "wanting" to fly, for instance, even though "hey! this is my dream!"

And that's because you created the dream with rules. You would first have to change the dreamworld to make it *possible* to fly, and *then* fly. Which you'll find is incredibly difficult.

> I didn't impose gravity on myself, it was imposed on me.

Perhaps you created a persistent, rule-based realm - and then forgot you did it. If you want to fly just by flapping your arms, you are going to have to first *make it possible* to fly doing this. *Then* flap your arms. I'm not saying it's easy to break such a fundamental rule. However, there are other things that are perhaps even more disturbing that *are* possible. Influencing the weather, for instance, seems to me more rule-breaking than flying - because in that case, you are affecting something that is *not part of your body*.

> No probability doesn't just say things are unlikely.

Really? If it can't be *quantified* then it's really just "stuff you think might happen anyway, but is unlikely". But let's skip that - you're saying that (according to Carroll) it's easier to use magick to produce an effect which you already consider to be within the realms of possibility.

Certainly that's true.

In other words, we're dealing with something which *might* happen anyway, it's just that we are helping it out by giving it a push. For sure. That's certainly a valid approach, but I'd hate to think people were limiting themselves to what they thought "might happen anyway" when experimenting for investigative purposes.

> If he was wrong, I think every magician would have won the lottery.

The "lottery winner" thing is interesting. Personally, I don't think I'd want to win the lottery. If you want to be wealthy, there are better ways. I would wonder whether anyone who could, would...?

For fun: if you wanted to win the lottery, using magick, how would you go about it?

> Yes, perhaps all the rules were created and forgotten by me. Nothing in reality suggests it and you can in no way prove that these rules are breakable.

Well, the difficult part is actually to prove *there are rules*. We can only say: "my experience is consistent with the notion that there are rules". Unfalsifiability and all that. But we're just exploring ideas here. What is the evidence that our common experience is how things have to be, and that they are a result of fixed rules? No evidence, other than the experience itself. If you manage to create a contrary experience, even once, then that idea of a rule-based reality - *rather than a habit-based one* - breaks down. I say rules are effectively just strong habits.

> You seem to take "I can do this" as proof that anything is possible.

For the purposes of discussion, here, we're talking about hypotheticals as much as anything else, right? You seem to be saying that whatever you *haven't* done is proof that it's *im-possible*. :-)

So - you bring up a good point about the rules of physics. Flapping my arms and flying would be a no-no, but pointing at the sky and the clouds disappearing would be okay - because we could say the second case was coincidence. It's borderline plausible but it *is* still plausible, right?

How far can we push it and still have it be okay, do you think? Is *not directly experiencing it happening* one ingredient which may help things? For instance, people driving somewhere and finding afterwards they've covered a 1hr journey in 30 minutes, that sort of thing.

> He used the term "higher probability" which in no way implies or suggests anything more than a vague sense.

I think we got caught up here. I just suggested that "plausibility" was a better word for general use - mainly because while in cases such as the lottery we might be able to have a literal probability, but in most cases we just mean "seems more likely". Nothing more than that!

> I am talking about the real lottery, not scratch of tickets.

Yeah, I had in mind the national lottery (or state lottery, or whatever, depending on your country).

I've never really given this much thought, but I guess I'd do my usual thing of *asserting it as fact* which is a sort of effortless willing. However, this requires a genuine desire and a bit of committed confidence. (This is where my thinking comes from that you probably can't easily do this: most don't really want it, those that do won't be able to commit due to doubt or conflict.)

What other, more "plausible-probable" things would fall into the same general category?

> Yes, those rules have been proven. Scientists didn't just write down "da laws of fisics" and that was that, these "rrules" are what we have after a long time of research.

I think you're getting hung up on something that we *can't* be disagreeing about.

People have over time seen "observed regularities" in nature. From there they have created descriptions (models) which help us talk about the world in terms of those regularities. The most basic of those we call "laws". The law *is* the repeated observation. A law is "a scientific generalization based on empirical observations of physical behavior".

By definition, only the most common, recurring patterns are described by physics, and from there only the simplest descriptions can become "laws". These laws are an account of *what we have seen*, not a statement about *how things work*.

Which doesn't necessarily mean you'll be flapping and flying any time soon. But it also doesn't mean that the world is a rule-based mechanical place as a whole.

> Forget coincidence, explain how cloudbursting breaks any law of physics.

Are you suggesting that cloudbursting by intention (rather than dumping chemicals on clouds from planes) can be described by the laws of physics?

> I'm saying that not being able to just fly... is a pretty good indication that we are not living in a fantasy world where are beliefs become real.

Only *you* are saying that "beliefs become real". I am just suggesting that a lack of belief tends to make it unlikely you'll engage in any prolonged experimentation in that direction.

And I still don't get why you would expect to be able to "just fly", any more than you'd expect to "just speak Hungarian".

It reminds me of people who oppose philosophical idealism because if everything is made from consciousness, why can't they just think objects into materialisation immediately! Which is as bad as saying, if I'm made of atoms why don't I have power over all the atoms in the world, since we're the same...

> Considering that time is not a unit of measurement for distance, I would say you made up those numbers to convince yourself that you did magic.

Hmm. Surely you get the point I was making there? That making a journey in impossible time. If you've played around with this, you must have had such an experience?

> But we don't have exact odds for the lottery. No equation accounts for the chance that a winning ticket gets destroyed.

Depends on the lottery. In the UK, you can work out the exact odds for a set of numbers corresponding to the randomly drawn numbers. Not sure if the process is different elsewhere?

Again, I am *not* saying that believing in something makes it happen, or that not-believing makes something not-happen. What I am saying instead is: We shouldn't assume that our everyday experience is the whole thing, and we shouldn't believe what other people say is impossible or possible - although it might provide inspiration. It's up to us to try things out.

> I'm kind of relearning that life is a giant lie and how gleefull people are in selling that lie for free.

What kind of lie?

> So we can only conclude that the universe seems to follow patterns when we have all these patterns down completely on paper?

It doesn't *follow* pattens. It *is* patterned. I'm saying it's not "rule-based and mechanical" but I'm not saying that it isn't patterned. In fact, I don't think humans can perceive anything that isn't patterned. In fact, my summary would be: "no pattern should be interpreted as being fixed and no *description* should be viewed as capturing a whole pattern".

This isn't controversial. This is exactly science's approach, right?

> [On cloudbursting...] I said I don't see how it breaks the laws of physics. I never said that it could be used to explain it.

I agree. But many would say that it *does* break the laws of physics, in that it can't be accounted for and is therefore impossible. I don't believe *lack of an explanation* means something is impossible. And neither do you, it seems.

> My point was that cloudbursting doesn't prove that anything is possible with your mind.

That can never be proved. If there's something you want to achieve, then you must experiment and see if it can't be done. If you can't, it's proof that... you didn't succeed. And maybe you never will, of course.

> No, if the world is just our imagination, asking why we can't imagine something else is a valid fucking question.

It's not "just" our imagination. It's a particular *imagining*, right? We have imagined that we live on a planet with gravity and water and all sort of other cool stuff. I don't see why you expect to be able to wish stuff different without any effort.

> Nobody ever ever has all the variables, yet we still call it probability. That's all my point wss, really. We never have all variables, even if they use really big numbers.

Right. That's true. So a *theoretical probability* then, based only on what we have included in our description or model. A bit like only including previous observations into a theory, and assuming that this is sufficient.

> I get it now. People with enough money to not have real problems, so they play pretend, with everyone else's lives.

Well, there's something to that, certainly.

> Stop saying we can just change reality and only offering excuses as to why it never fucking works.

Y'know what? I've no idea how it works, not exactly anyway. That's the problem. Which means I also can't tell why things *don't* work. Things do change in unlikely ways. I don't think it's to do with belief *or* effort. When things happen, it's not about trying. It definitely involves detachment and it definitely involves "will" via (optionally) imagination. And it always produces some sort of result, although sometimes it's just symbolic (like, encountering stuff *about* your desire but getting your actual desire).

Things do sorta work how you think they do. But I don't mean how you *choose* to think *about* them. I mean, how you think they do when you ask yourself how you think something works. (Sorry, that's not very well worded.) I guess that sounds like "belief" but that word is so misused now.

Really it's better to say that it's to do with your own patterning. That changing your own patterning (or "formatting") is the way to produce change, and the way to change your patterning is via will and imagination.

> The occultist joins an order to learn magic and improve his life, they teach him to clear his mind so they can fill it.

I don't believe in any of that order stuff much. I think most organised occultism is pretty uninteresting or was about management. Meanwhile, people keep trying to look for explanations and reasons, and they get further away from understanding. Every new theory or technique is a step away from achieving anything.

The problem isn't necessarily that we can't do things, it's that we don't know how to test whether we can do them or not? It's not belief, it's not effort. I'd say it's "willed imagination without obstruction" but that's hardly a very useable description. Within that, the actual details don't seem to matter much. Which means testing possibility is an issue.

> [Q: I think I am starting to see what you mean. Making assumptions of reality kind of limits what we choose to experiment with and how. Believing that we are made of complete solid matter would of course throw off any research into teleportation, just as whatever mistakes we have now likely prevent us from trying the right things or asking the right questions about certain phenomenon.]

Right, you've said it much more clearly than I did, but that's what I was trying to get at.

Which might mean that the deepest, most subtle traps we find ourselves in are transparent to us - they might be things we don't even realise we are assuming!

I think the basics should be largely left alone for everyday life. You don't want to destroy its fundamental continuity!

Extreme version: Some autistic children have a hard time trusting that the lessons they learned remain true without continually re-testing them - e.g. that the floor still supports their weight; that an object that goes out of sight will still be there later. So I guess it's more assumptions about personal achievement on a more macro-scale. We don't want to be reformatting ourselves at too low a level. We don't want to have to manually handle all the details, after all.

I think autism has much to teach us. One of my ideas: that their attention is narrowed on the current sensory experience, and they have no *felt-sense* for the underlying facts of the world. The world has no baseline solidity for them; it's transient imagery and memory, without *knowing*. The "facts" don't stick or they are not aware of the place where the "facts" are stored! (Which I think is literally in the central "gut feeling" we have.)

I think in other societies the autistic child and the schizophrenic and the epileptic (not equating those, just examples) would be considered as having a "connection" to a larger field of experience. Their relative lack of daily-life-handling would be allowed for, and their talents maximised.

The uniformity of western societies doesn't really allow for individuality of talent or perception. Roles are prearranged slots; society tries to mould its children into them but by assuming them to be identical and "formable". Which, obviously, is quite a horrific approach. Not everyone takes to the "training".

Reply to “Stupid question, but nagging me. If belief affects reality, do schizophrenics and narcissists have an advantage?”

I don't think beliefs shape reality; but they do filter the "infinite gloop" of reality. More specifically: they filter the experience, but not the ability. What does it mean to "do" something? It means: intending it and subsequently experiencing it. There is no actual "doing" involved at any point; there is only the "experience of doing". Given this, the narcissist and the schizophrenic don't have an advantage because they don't have the intention aspect under control.

The narcissist is vulnerable and self-deludes; he fantasises about status but does not intend results. He sees confirmation in existing situations through mild synchronicity but does not actively leverage them in a magickal way (I suggest). The schizophrenic, meanwhile, is cracked wide open to an expanded experience. Again, he does not have intention under control. He is simply bombarded with extra information and massive alignments. His intensity means he is constantly *willing* and shifting his world. If he is lucky, he will learn to use some of it to his advantage. More likely, his lack of "formatting" will render him confused.

"Normal" people with magickal ambitions have enough trouble grasping the idea of *will*; these guys are further disadvantaged in that, just in opposite ways.

Reply to “Are you studying too much?”

My thought: **keep *purpose* in mind.**

It's lots of fun to *read-about* and explore and experiment, but you have to keep the balance between your outer life and your inner life. They are undivided and the same, and both need your attention so that they support one another. If you can tie your occult studies to definite outer aims, that can help. Why not combine your art with your magick? Whether that's summoning inspiration, or actually embedding magick into it.

There's an infinite amount to "learn", but also nothing much to learn. Your life is just made up of experiences. At the moment you are choosing to experience "reading a lot" and "thinking about this topic a lot". Sometimes the implicit fantasy-dream element of magick can be a whole lot more attractive than the apparently mundane everyday life stuff, but:

The true purpose of practical magick is to summon/improve your experiences, whether that's to clear out some misconceptions so that you have a clearer view of reality (inner), or to generate specific experiences you desire (outer). (Note: "experiences" includes "the experience of owning an object", etc.) So, decide what experiences you want to have, and start using magick to access them. If you don't do this, then you are reading and studying without focus - just for the wank of it basically - and that'll go on forever.

All magickal traditions have the same underlying idea, because they are dealing with the same underlying universe. Be sure to read some stuff that tries to strip it back. This just helps stop you getting too lost in the more fantastical elements (which do exist, but are not necessarily required).

Having said all that, coming to your own personal "worldview" is very beneficial, whether that's "**the world is a lucid dream, amongst many**" or whether "we are but fragments of a turtle's shell". So that's one aim you can have when doing all your reading: synthesising your own approach and working out its implications for your real life.

TL;DR: Uh-huh, but **remember to live your life.**

Reply to “OK I'm a Cliche, but how to find "it", that "proof" of the occult whether physical, mental, spiritual!”

You know, I'm still actually not sure what you're after here?

Well, it doesn't work like that. This isn't physics - where you look for observed regularities and construct a theory. It's the mind, observed by the mind, as formed by the mind. **Any viewpoint that you *commit* to will start to shape your experience into that form, passively. It'll just happen.** If you don't commit to any one outlook, that won't happen. You'll get glimmers of "alignment" wherever you seek.

If you start thinking of the world in a certain way and fully absorb that, you'll start to experience the world in that way. And it will be impossible to say whether that is how the world "really, really works" because: a) you have no access to an external, causal reality, meaning: b) there is effectively no such thing. Your "world" is the regularities of your experience. Your experience is made from mind. The format of your mind therefore informs your experiences. Looking for proof is like looking for your eyes. There is no external to your experience.

TL;DR: **You *will* be wandering aimlessly until you *commit* to a particular worldview** - i.e. **adopt a particular mind format** - kinda by definition.

Reply to “Anyone else feel like this when first beginning?”

RAW got me started: *Quantum Psychology* and *Prometheus Rising*. You can really overthink this though: it, of course, is actually super, super simple. The more you think about it, the more you will obscure it. You "are the dream, are consciousness" right now - you are just obscuring it by looking and thinking. There is no theory to this, it is not made of concepts and cannot be understood in that sense. It can be talked about, but really it is something you experience.

Do a daily practice like this:

- 10 minutes, twice a day.
- Lie down on the floor, feet flat with knees bent, head supported by books, arms by your side or hands resting on abdomen.
- Decide to give up completely to gravity: to "play dead".
- Let go of your body and mind, let them move as will. Allow them to unwind.
- Don't even "pay attention"; just let it be open and wide. If it focuses on some thought or pain briefly, let that happen, and let it open out again.
- After 10 minutes, decide to get up, but don't do anything about it. Wait until your body moves by itself. (Thus won't happen first time, but eventually it will happen.)

Basically, you are letting the "stuck thoughts" and "uncompleted movements" you have amassed unwind and dissolve themselves. You do not need to do anything for this to occur. Gradually, your perception will become clearer and clearer. Note: Any effort to focus or do anything will get in the way. There is a method of accelerating this by "overwriting yourself", but it's nicer this way.

Reply to “Occultism and Depression”

Also, how does being an occultist change your approach to depression? Are you more likely to try to solve things yourself? Are you more likely to interpret the symptoms "esoterically"? And can you treat yourself "magickally" from the outset?

I wonder whether the sense of increased personal power can work beneficially and against too.

The seratonin-uptake model of depression is in doubt these days, for instance, and many depression medications have been criticised for being little more than placebo. If that's the case, then coming out of depression really *is* a work of magick (as in, intention and commitment, interpretation/declaration of an act as causal, rather than the nature of the act itself).

And 'consciousness-widening' acts might well loosen its hold?

I think the occultist is better placed to do things such as experiment or understand their attention and their state and transform that. Even simple things, like hypnosis/visualisation to "energise" oneself or change one's "mental posture" can be good. And an occultist is more likely to have developed the ability to "commit" to an act such as this. I think that having some sort of daily practice is more common for development generally, and might help depression too.

Another thought was: The occultist is likely to have long terms aims to succeed at this or that, and Will for particular results or life-changes in the future. This can help "keep life running" whilst depressed, if they can at least stick to that, because things have been set up in advance.

Reply to “It's been fun but I've failed”

Don't give up; I know where you're at.

There are lots of types of "magick", some of which may not fall obviously under that banner.

For depression though, **keep busy! Stop thinking. *Completely*. Life can't be worked out, it's not something that can be "solved"**, and depression doubly-not. Wash the dishes, clean the bathroom, make tasty meals for yourself, make yourself socialise no matter what. Decide to *get on with life* no matter how you're feeling (easier said than done, but you can't solve the depression and *then* live, it works the other way around).

Physical pain often comes hand-in-hand with depression; the ongoing "compression" feeling can be the problem itself. Do a daily relaxation exercise (lie on the floor, head supported, and "give up completely" for 10 minutes) to let yourself settle out at least once a day. Main thing is to be good and compassionate to yourself, and forgiving! I was always super-harsh on myself when I wasn't "happening", and that was the worst thing to do.

Good luck! :-)

Reply to “How to find something that was hidden from me by another?”

Try this:

- Sit down. Quietly.
- Decide that your body is a "shell". You are simply an observer of its movements.
- In other words, you *do not interfere*. You simply allow your body-shell to *move by itself*.
- Command it thus: "shell, go to where <object> is"
- Wait for the shell to move by itself, to wherever it wants to go.
- Enjoy being reunited with <object>

EDIT: Additional point:

- Send Triumphant George a share of the treasure! ;-)

What is the word that even in plain sight remains hidden?
Answer: Hidden

Reply to “Visualizing with your body as well as with your brain. The stretched third eye.”

Well, isn't this just you noticing that all your experiences occur in the same "perceptual space"? I mean, the "head" you think you are thinking in now isn't your real head... it's just an area in your overall extended spatial experience in your mind. The room around you is literally your mind, and you can "reach out" into it and visualise into it anywhere. If you "expand out" your attention into the space around you, you'll find you can be the whole room. Because this whole room *is your imagination* and anything you think in that space *is your imagination*. I have a little metaphor I use to help remind me of this. (Note: in reality it's more like a "holographic conscious space" but the floor-pattern idea is quite, um, grounding and accessible.)

The Imagination Room

There is a vast room. The floor is transparent, and through it an infinitely bright light shines, completely filling the room with unchanging, unbounded white light. Suddenly, patterns start to appear on the floor. These patterns filter the light. The patterns accumulate, layer upon layer intertwined, until instead of homogenous light filling the room, the light seems to be holographically redirected by the patterns into the shape of *experiences*, arranged in space, unfolding over time. Experiences which consist of sensations, perceptions and thoughts. At the centre of the room there are bodily sensations, which you recognise as... you, your body. You decide to centre yourself in the upper part of that region, as if you were "looking out from" there, "being" that bodily experience. At the moment you are simply experiencing, not doing anything. However you notice that every experience that arises slightly deepens the pattern corresponding to it, making it more stable, and more likely to appear again as the light is funnelled into that shape.

Now, you notice something else. If you create a thought, then the image will appear floating in the room - as an experience. Again, the corresponding pattern is deepened. Only this time, you are *creating* the experience and in effect creating a new habit in your world! Even saying a word or a phrase triggers the corresponding associations, so it is not just the simple thought that leaves a deeper pattern, but the whole context of that thought, its history and relationships.

Now, as you walk around today, you will feel the ground beneath your feet - but you will know that under what appears to be the ground is actually the floor of the room, through which the light is shining, being shaped into the experience around you. And every thought or experience you have is shifting the pattern...

[...]

I think of it as most people have a "bag of metaphors" rather than a philosophical system, which is why it tends to be incoherent, being unexamined - e.g. that the "we are our brains, run by chemicals" but that obviously we make choices and have free will, etc. People may ever assert that they are "machines or computers" but one second later they will state a belief contrary to that. This is a good thing - that lack of coherence - because it means the errors can be easily overturned. The reason I don't like calling it a "philosophical system" is because that implies some sort of coherence. And it doesn't match with people's actual experience of their thinking in this case.

> They think past causes the present.

Always a trick. Since I'm lazy, I'm not going to cut-and-paste a metaphor I was discussing elsewhere, trying to show that there is just an ongoing (and effectively "dumb") pattern which evolves, including the part of the pattern which we might call "the past".

On Time and Metaphor

His [Alan Watts'] metaphor of "the ship and its wake" is excellent for capturing your true situation. From his book *What is Zen?*...

> We think that the world is limited and explained by its past. We tend to think that what happened in the past determines what is going to happen next, and we do not see that it is exactly the other way around! What is always the source of the world is the present; the past doesn't explain a thing. The past trails behind the present like the wake of a ship, and eventually disappears.
>
> Now you would say that obviously when you see a ship crossing the ocean with the wake trailing behind it that the ship is the cause of the wake. But if you get into the state of mind that believes in causality as we do, you see that the wake is the cause of the ship! And that is surely making the tail wag the dog!
>
> The point is this: You will never find the mystery of the creation of the world in the past. It never was created in the past. Because truly there is nothing else — and never was anything else — except the present! There never will be anything else except the present.
>
> -- *What is Zen?*, Alan Watts

Now, this essentially means there isn't even really a "present" - rather, there is an "ongoing unfolding". A pattern which is evolving its shape, a bit like those video-feedback patterns you get when you point a camera at a screen showing its own image. If it's an old CRT screen with a bit of a smearing, then that captures the whole situation: the main pattern is slightly smeared as it goes with a slight after-image. This smearing, that after-image which forms part of the main image, is something we called the "past" or the "context".

Thing is, if that video image just suddenly changed dramatically and discontinuously - say, from circle-based imagery to square-based - then after a moment of tangled confusion all trace of the old circle-based imagery would be gone. All there would be, would be the square-based imagery and the square-based "smear".

In other words, our "world" always seems to be consistent *as if* there is a past causing it, one that is of the same structure as "the world". But in fact, the metaphor shows us that the present is either uncaused, or caused by something quite different to any image, or caused "by itself" - the "past" is simply a part of the present image, just of a different intensity to the rest of the image. Any causal frameworks we read into the patterns are simply accidental regularities, in among the semi-randomness of feedback, which we have become fixated upon; after-images which keep being re-triggered so as never to fade completely. The patterns themselves have no such causal structure, it exists only in our interpretation...

EDIT: Did some minor editing on the last paragraph to mention the re-triggering for observed regularities. Obviously the "camera" and the "screen" and the "image" are all one, once you take this a step further, and the complexities lead to repeating stabilities, but the essence is there.

[...]

> I agree, but this might be intentional. [Lack of "meta" level to education.]

I do think this is intentional - or at least, unintentionally intentional. The education system is not really designed for free and frank inquiry, exploration into the nature of the world and oneself. It's far more a "shaping of people" to fit the predefined requirements of the economy (or *aspects* of the economy). Education is mostly *training*. And largely behavioural training at that; behavioural structuring, particularly around artificial notions of time and of "hierarchy" in the general sense.

It's actually quite disadvantageous to have many intelligent people, from a certain point of view. In fact, probably very few people who are in positions of influence are especially intelligence; it's more a matter of emotional management and "flexibility in the face of moral ambiguity".

Reply to “Is there any ideology/religion that you find "wrong"?”

Religious *organisations* tend to want complete control over their followers (christianity too), but that's a matter of the nature of people, and the power that privileged positions and promoting certain 'interpretations' gives, and capitalising on the fear of the times, which then gets perpetuated.

Religions themselves, the original teachings, that's a different thing.

> [Q: ‘original teachings’; Are a hard thing to 'prove' to people :|]

Yes. You have to 'prove' it to yourself, by experimentation.

Reply to “Spirit Possession on LSD.”

I wouldn't take the *content* of your experience too literally. In my view, things like LSD simply loosen up your constraints and your experience becomes less logically structured, more associative. They are *real as experiences*, but they are not real in terms of there being some fundamental truth to them beyond that. All experiences are relative. This is true of everyday life as well as "unusual" experiences; they are all of the same type. They all arise in the mind, and reveal the patterning of the mind, rather than the patterning of some fictional "external" world beyond it.

For instance: *The Patterning of Experience* and related links.

Have you ever had a lucid dream? They can be more real than real. Sometimes they can last what seems like months, even years. Imagine if you had a lucid dream one night, but had never heard of lucid dreams. What would you make of it? ("I love lamp.")

Reply to “Dreams mingling with reality”

It's simplest to view these things as synchronicity - by which I simply mean, part of a larger pattern that is "across time", regardless of the "3D moment" you are presently attending to.

But generally:

-- The apparent division between waking and dreaming is arbitrary - they are both just experiences you are having, sensory experiences arising in your "mind-space".

-- The "patterning" of your mind-space affects all your experiences, no matter what the apparent context.

How it works:

-- Experiences leave traces which *in-form* subsequent experiences.

-- Thoughts are also experiences - *in-form-ation* which shapes subsequent experiences.

-- The patterning which results, when obvious, is called "synchronicity".

TL;DR: What you are is an "open aware mind-space in which experiences arise". The formatting of that mind-space affects all your experiences - waking, dreaming or thoughts.

Reply to “What does r/occult think of r/dimensionaljumping”

> People here can greatly influence what goes on there. I feel like it is a very useful idea that needs to be taught by you folks.

The problem is, we can easily end up with just one big "magickal soup" with people exchanging the same received wisdom, all "educating" one another about how *this-thing* is "really" *that-thing*, and so on.

Although the origin of /r/dimensionaljumping was people playing around with mirror rituals, over time it's become something else: a place to explore the "nature of experiencing" for people who either don't have a background in that sort of thing, or want to approach it from a relatively clean slate in terms of language and metaphysics. I think all of us tend to get distracted by the models and concepts from the past, perhaps reify them as being special, even though with their context unavailable their meaning is often now not clear - or perhaps seems *incorrectly* obvious. They get taken *pseudo-literally*. People spend time looking for "the secrets" when there really are none; you just have to experiment. So we just put that aside. At most, there's a highly abstract base model of "patterned meaning" of an apparently subjective perspective.

So for sure, the various exercises contributors come up with do allow people to recognise that "something is going on" and get some results, but the larger purpose is to question things more deeply without becoming attached to any one narrative. And that includes the idea of "dimensional jumping" itself, which isn't meant to be "how it works" - it's simply an example of an equivalent "pattern" one can adopt, a seed for thinking this stuff out. Eventually, one realises there *is* no "how it works", of course, and your concept of "you" gets updated accordingly. But just reading that doesn't really help anyone get it or apply it.

Anyway, all this is why the meat of things tends to happen in the discussions rather than in the posts. The mods keep their hands off, because it's all about the experimentation. Then every now and again someone shows up to say sarcastically, "nice one so you've discovered 'sigils' eh?" - to which the answer would be: so what *is* a sigil and how, *exactly*, does it work? And so on.

That's the rationale, anyway

/r/Psychonaut/

Reply to “This sub doesn't feel too grounded in reality to me.”

> > OP: I understand in a general sense that we are all one because we are experiencing the same moment (all existence) but fail to see how this colourful language helps beyond that.

Those ideas arise from *direct* experiences. The same ideas come up again and again in history from various independent traditions. Sure, they are interpretations - but the core experience isn't a general sense of a lack of division or a convergence, it is a *direct knowing by experience* of this.

In the same way as, say, touching a table surface you *know* that it is a hard surface. You don't know this generally or through building a conceptual model; it is simply true.

The poetic words and meanderings are then an attempt to put into language something that can't really be put into language. Without the experience behind you, those words don't have much meaning. Just as the word "red" or - better - the world "love" wouldn't mean anything if you had never had the corresponding experiences.

[...]

> > I actually have had DMT many times and high dose mushrooms. The experiences have been reality and life changing but I understand it is brain chemistry being effected and don't feel the need to describe anything as mystical.

Do you understand that, or do you think-assume that? Certainly brain activation changes, but that doesn't explain the actual experience at all. For instance, if I reach an insight about my life during an experience, I cannot find that insight via fMRI, etc. I cannot find the experience in chemistry. So I think both sides - both angles of exploration and description - are valid, but they are "about" different things.

> > [Q: I have never heard of someone 'think-assume'ing. I am sure you just mean 'assume' on its own. If you think you can't track/analyse an experience down to certain levels scientifically you are very unaware of the breakthroughs in science in the last 15 years. And even if we couldn't track an experience and measure its value it has on you with certain brain chemicals released such as dopamine that still nothing to do with whether the hallucinations from drug-related or sober experiences have any truth to the nature of our reality.]

It was meant to be a "/".
Let's jump to it:

- Does anyone ever have an "objective experience"?
- How do we decide what is "objective" and what is "subjective"?
- How do we decide what is a hallucination and what is not? It's not easy.

EDIT: Just realised I've started two strands on this which kinda overlap. Let's let them both run for one more?

> [Q: Broadly we need to clarify what objective and subjective mean. A proposition is generally considered objectively true (to have objective truth) when its truth conditions are met and are "bias-free"; that is, existing without biases caused by, feelings, ideas, etc. of a sentient subject. So basically to answer all your questions; reality is objective by definition because it is what is real, we as sentient beings experience the world subjectively. There is no such thing as an objective reality and subjective reality working separately, the subjective reality feeds from the objective reality but runs it through the animalistic filter. Both are happening at once.]

Yes, let's define! Perhaps what you've done there is to define "the real" as:

- That which can be experienced subjectively, and
- Can be described to another and understood, and
- Seems to happen "over there" rather than "over here" (where my thoughts and feelings seem to be), and
- Has a stability or persistence to it over a reasonable timescale.

We *suppose* that it is fed by something we call "objective reality" (which is a concept we have), that this underlies our individual experiences, and that is why we can discuss experiences. However, all we are really establishing is that there is a commonality of *descriptions* which are a subset of our larger subjective experiences. So, experiences we can shared descriptions of we call "real" and the rest not. The middle ground is that there are experience some people have had and others have not. Does this mean that their experiences are not "real"? What if having a particular experience requires training to have?

How many people need to have the experience before it is real - or are we *only* including over-there experiences?

What I'm getting at is, people who describe having a "oneness" experience can be describing an objective reality. We might detect the brain lighting up when someone meditates and they report that experience. How does this differ from the brain lighting up which someone is presented with visual stimulus, and later reports "seeing"

[...]

> > Subjective descriptive language has nothing to do with reality and truth.

Sorry to interject but - really? It think that this is where you are going astray. Science is itself a subjective endeavour, which chooses to limit accepted findings to those that can be described in language and communicated easily between people. And it is very successful because of this. However, this means it deals with a *subset* of subjective experience; it does not mean it deals with an "objective" world.

Poetic language is an attempt to point to the aspects of subjective experience that cannot be easily described, and cannot be encapsulated in scientific conceptual frameworks. Typically, poetic language tries to capture the environment *within which* the subset of science operates. If there is a proposed fundamental truth to reality, if it cannot be subjectively directly perceived then it is simply an *idea* **about** reality, not reality itself.

Science never claims to find truth, only to connect "observed regularities" into a coherent *description*.

> [Q: I am not sure if we are talking about the same thing here. I am saying that language is merely a descriptive tool of reality. Just because we can *describe* something with language doesn't mean it is or

has to be true... or have *anything* to do with reality. I can describe an amazing purple dragon in the sky above me but that has NOTHING to do with the reality that there is no dragon.]

Right, perhaps we are slightly out of alignment. It's not about the dragons though. This isn't about *thoughts*, this is about direct experience. See if I can be clearer.

Better: All language is surely an attempt to describe experience. All language describes a subject experience really. Science, implicitly, focussed on observed regular experiences that are *seen*, visual experiences. It is the most shareable aspect of experience. Sound and texture too can be translated reasonably well into visual representations, which are then described and shared by language.

One aspect of experience that cannot be easily captured is that of feeling/sensing/direct knowing/direct intuition (we don't even have a proper word for it). Art is an attempt to render that visually. Poetic language is an attempt to invoke imagery to point towards it.

This aspect of experience is as much a part of reality as seeing, hearing, touch - *all of which are actually subjective*. However our inability to communicate about this particular aspect means it cannot be cleanly represented like the others.

The highlights:

- This isn't about *thinking-about* things.
- **All experience is subjective.**
- Some parts of subjective experience (seeing, hearing, touch) are more easy to create *shareable representations* of than others.
- Just because some aspects of subjective experience are not easy to *share* in this way does not mean they are not "part of reality". We call this subset "objective reality" but really we mean "easy to share via language".
- It is possible that key information about reality may come in the form of this *felt-sense*. Without having had the experience, other people will think the description of this as meaningless and poetic. Just as a man who has never seen colours might think descriptions of the world in terms of "vibrant red and blue" as poetic nonsense which isn't part of "reality".

Reply to “Continuity”

> OP: How much value do you guys place on continuity in your experience? Would you trade continuity for super powers? How about bliss? Nirvana?

Discontinuity all the way.

> [OP: Wow, a discussion on a 6 day old thread nice! I agree, discontinuity allows more freedom in a way, and in a sense the continuity we experience is kind of imagined. I mean, we are never the same as we were, we just think we are. Makes me feel a little less sad about losing one of my favourite notebooks (believe it or not the same notebook from my story on glitch_in_the_matrix, which I take it you read) where I wrote down a lot of my passions and dreams. They're bound to change anyway, but still it hurts.. I want it to show up. I guess that's me wanting continuity. I'm a conflicted soul in this way.]

Was browsing and the title caught my attention (I love the idea of "discontinuities). Anyway -

- We are always the same "background", but the content changes.

Discontinuities in the content would make life far more flexible. If you don't mind things appearing/disappearing, your circumstances changing dramatically, your environment shifting - you can have everything, potentially! But you can also *lose* everything, potentially. If you are willing to let your world be that ephemeral, then one moment may not lead to the next. All vision might fade...

Thing is, where was that notebook when it wasn't in your hands? It was just a thought in your head (or actually, a 'background feeling/knowing'). The thing itself wasn't anywhere. You never had it in the first place, much. But, yeah, I know what you mean. Losing things hollows out a bit of your emotional self/content, and leaves a gap. A petit mort! Time for a magickal spell, perhaps, to have it re-materialise?

Have you thought about how you might capitalise on/create discontinuities?

> Isn't the world already that ephemeral, it's just I don't perceive it to be.. yet?

Yes, it is, I would say.

The Model

My general model for this is, quickly:

- Think of yourself as the background of experience, the 'awareness' in which it arises.
- Experiences arise, and leave traces.
- Those traces then structure subsequent experiences, leaving traces, deepening patterns, creating tendencies.
- Unfolded objects > enfolded forms > unfolded objects > . . .
- Experiences then tend towards stability -> objects and narrative.

- We could call these laws (apparent physical laws, cause and effect), habits (repeated actions) and beliefs (lighter patterns structuring our perception).
- But: There is no "real" underneath. Like hypnogogia before sleep, sparkles > fragments > images > objects > environments > dreams. Randomness becomes stability, unfolding both deterministically and creatively.

Anyway, with that out the way, the content of our experience is just that, it's just what we perceive and nothing more. Objects are made of "eyes and fingers", with no solid backing. In a lucid dream, if you declare a new fact (state a new belief) and don't resist it, the experience comes to be. Content aligns with your beliefs. I think that waking life is very similar, albeit more stable and sluggish, because it has been around a lot longer than your dreams; it has solidified. But all that is preventing a complete discontinuity isn't the continuousness of content - that is illusory - it is the stability of the beliefs or 'enfolded forms' in awareness.

The Implication

If you start tinkering with your beliefs and expectations, your experiences tend to adjust. You get coincidences and synchronicities. It's as if your world tries its best to "line up" with what you've decided the facts should be. This is how "magickal traditions" all work at their root. But the kicker: Adopting a new belief, or "inserting new facts", is easy: you simply declare the new truth. No effort required. However, you must *completely let go of resistance to what happens, to the change, and to the new idea*.

That's quite frightening. Anything could happen.

Getting extreme and unlikely: Say something happened in the past and you'd like to change it. Say you could, by simply lying down, letting go completely, and declaring it so - say you could suddenly find yourself "reset" to that time. Would you do it? If I told you (I'm not, but as an emotional experiment) that *this could be done*. Would you? I reckon you'd find it hard to make yourself do it. The implications for the reality of your surroundings, what "people" really are, etc, are pretty disconcerting!

An Experiment

You should try an experiment, via the Alan Chapman book maybe. Simply declare: "My book will come to me this month" or "My book is coming to me this month" - it has to be worded as a *present fact* - and let that become true to you. ;-)

Note: It's about the *feeling of it being true*, rather than imagining it in pictures or whatever. Simply the statement, and the acceptance of the feeling. It's a fun experiment. Whether it works, who can tell - - - I've experimented a bit with discontinuities, but you have to be careful. The truths you adopt really do have an effect: So, if you start thinking poorly of yourself, for instance, then things line up very quickly to prove you right! I've seen depressive people enter massive doom-spirals because of that.

So it's important to "think positive" - but not in the cheesy, "positive thinking" way - rather, in adopting a positive, desirable vision for your life as a *feeling*. (A bit like old Neville Goddard's idea.)

Well, personal experience is the key - decide for yourself what is true for you. Take on other people's ideas and see what they add to your own understanding/knowing. Yeah, 'love and light', that's the way.

And remember you have to live the humdrum aspects of life as well as the more random/exciting/bizarre ones, while you are still in amongst it! :-)

Have fun - - -

Reply to “Everything you could ever possibly imagine already exists in an implicate form. When you imagine it, you're basically finding a vision of a possible future - whether you want to pursue and manifest that vision is entirely your choice.”

How is the implicit made explicit?

> [Q: That's asking how the universe came to be and how/why it unfolds. I don't know if we'll ever find a meaningful answer to that. Think of the following analogy: a chessboard has 8x8 squares and, depending on the interaction of the pieces, reaches a different configuration every time. However, within the concept of the game of chess & its rules lies the seed for every possible permutation that could come forth out of it. This is the implicit order, it is implied through the ingredients of the system. The actual unfolding of a game, the route it carves out through its 'search-space', is the explicit order. If the chess analogy doesn't really resonate, you can imagine the same analogy for the creation of images or pictures
>
> Now, you have humans playing chessgames and making pictures, but for reality the driving force could simply be the universe, discovering and learning itself. So my only possible answer to your question is: the implicit is made explicit because the universe is the result of energy/raw consciousness trying to understand itself.]

I like the chess analogy and "search space". What I wondered about the implicit in my pondering moments was: We say that it exists, but does it exist in terms of actually being there, enfolded, or is it rather that there are a number of "possible states" within the rules, that can therefore be made explicit. Really, the latter, as a configuration space. Not that we could tell the difference. But then, what does it mean to be "explicit" anyway - just experienced in the senses? An implicit option, attended to. The universe *has* been busy, it seems!

> > I guess the most intuitive way of putting this is that the explicit can be equated to our subjective experience, our feeling of 'now', of what the implicit order has unfolded through time.

Yes. "Unfolded" into subjective experience. With the *facts-of-the-world* dissolved, timelessly and spacelessly, into the background, always present and available to be focused upon ("made explicit").

Which loops round to our beginning: what is the selection mechanism by which infinity is filtered down to a particular moment vs another? I guess, via the accumulated superposition of all patterns ("the rules" and archetypes) which definite possibilities, then by our intention.

> [Q: My mind is not entirely clear on that process yet. There's the whole 'deterministic/mechanistic' thing, but on the other hand there's consciousness acting as a driving force. They're both true, in a sense, it just seems to be 'intention' being modulated at a different level of complexity. That's why I said I think biological evolution and our thinking process is essentially the same thing.]

I think that *paths* can be deterministic overall, what matters is that you have choice at the level your are at, of the deterministic paths "below" you. Which pretty much ties in with what you just said.

I think of it as "filtering patterns", with some patterns (time) more established than others (belief, expectation, knowledge) and some much more flexible (intention). When we make a decision to have an experience, we are adjusting the "intention" pattern to allow the desired experience to unfold - whether that be "I want to experience my arm raising", or something more complex, maybe not directly associated with your action.

> [Q: Interesting way of formulating it! I was just pondering how string theory would suggest that the explicit universe is essentially a heavily modulated signal. Everything is just vibrations. And it happens at different scales, over different levels of complexity. So it's funny how you mention filtering, since that's what signal processing is all about :) So the universe is a self-filtering signal and an infinitely recursive fractal .... this is some straight up M.C. Escher stuff]

Right, good comparison... and **the "self" and the signal is *you*.**

Reply to “Shroom trip helped me "feel" the things I've read about.”

> [Q: It's a very particular kind of solipsism that rarely goes under that name. I like to refer to it as positive solipsism. If an individual is All, and/or all individuals are aspects of All, then everything and everyone a given individual encounters is an aspect of that individual. I regard this as more positive because it is "everything is a part of me (and I should therefore be selfless)" as opposed to "nothing is real except me (and I should therefore be selfish)."]

So it depends, perhaps, on what the OP means by "me". If he means he has recognised his true nature as the background "larger self", and that all people - including his "personal self" - are aspects of that, then that's different to saying the whole world *is* your "personal self" (solipsism as we usually think of it).

In that case, everyone has the same "larger self" and isn't solipsism? Because the "larger self" isn't a "person" at all, it's basically saying "we're all part of the connected, single universe" (a solipsism of universes rather than people!).

[[Q: But the enlightened individual (archetypally, at least) is unified with All, becomes All, contains that connected universe internally. To expand on that (or in addition to that; it's hard to tell) in an inextricably bound universe in which there are no meaningful divisions at all, the individual who, in context, is the first person perspective, the narrator, the experiencer, necessarily becomes a positive solipsist to some degree, whether or not they acknowledge the experiencing of others. The first person takes precedent, and to the experiencer, a reality in which all things flow together looks very much like a reality emnating from or being projected by their own self; experiencing as imagining. This view can be entertained at the same time as more popular, objective measures of reality, whether separately or in unison, given a healthy measure of uncertainty and/or contradictory, divine truth. After all, if I (or you) create everything around, or if the greater All, separately from us, divides itself simply to have fun (a la Hinduism's lila) contradictory viewpoints are entirely acceptable, as long as they are entertaining. Which is why I just went at such length, for the most part: It was entertaining, and it reflects my current mindset.]]

> > But the enlightened individual (archetypally, at least) is unified with All, becomes All, contains that connected universe internally.

But surely always was that and made from that, they just *imagined* (had a thought that) they were separate.

> > **experiencing as imagining.**

I liked that. I agree that entertainment is one of the primary movers of the universe. :-)

Reply to “Any older(maybe even wiser) Psychonauts here?”

> [Q: I'm almost twice your age. I see a lot of younger people falling into the same kinds of traps I once did. Most prominent is thinking that some particular belief must be true because it is internally consistent. There are many things that are coherent, match patterns, and "feel right", but the vast majority of these things are not true. Developing the habit of questioning everything I believe constantly has been very good for me.]

A great point. My favourite! Two types of truth:

- ***Conceptual/Pattern Truth*** - Something feels true because the conceptual framework it is a part of is self-supporting. This is the feeling of 'coherence and elegance'. However, it can be a castle in the sky; it need have no relationship whatsoever to other parts of reality to generate that feeling. These tend to be *thoughts-about* other experiences or *patterns-about*. A strategy developed on a nice map doesn't necessarily translate to a result in the field. However, it might be *art*.
- ***Direct Truth*** - The hardness of a table, the sense of *being-aware*, direct visual observation of an action and a result. Truths that are simply experiences, rather than *thoughts-about* experiences.

Obviously, the two are tangled somewhat, but it pays to be wary of enthusing about 'elegance' other than for its own sake.

Reply to “Why is it that the things happening inside our brain, are instead experienced as if they are happening outside of our body?”

Things *don't* happen inside *your* brain. They happen within your awareness. Your perceptions, your thoughts, all happen within your awareness. The brain and body, meanwhile, is the 3rd-person image of the the activity of localised consciousness. The image is correlated, but not causal, with experience.

> I'd be interested to see the research demonstrating this.

You can do the research yourself right now! Examine your own experience, back it up with a bit of reading on metaphysics, neuroscience and consciousness, there you go! ;-)

More seriously... Donald Hoffman - "He received his BA from UCLA in Quantitative Psychology and his Ph.D. from MIT in Computational Psychology" - gave an accessible talk on his interface theory of perception that you might find interesting though. It's a bit more accessible than the published papers. John Searle's opaque comments are always interesting, but you might find the links in this post about Darkroom Vision worth your time.

> [Q: So two guys, basically. Only one of which has published any research papers. If I ask around about how credible the rest of their field considers them, what am I likely to hear? There is a saying: "Beware the man of one book". I think for the same reason it's wise to beware the man of one study, or who puts all of his confidence in a single figure because that guy agrees with him and seems sciencey/credible. The nature of truth is that it's convergent. Loads of people will arrive at it independently regardless of era or geographical distance. Has this happened yet for the idea that consciousness creates reality? Moreover, I have done some simple experiments myself as you suggested and I cannot seem to instantiate objects or alter objects in front of me by thinking about it. How do you account for this?]

(Responding to the initial version of your comment.)

What, you're *really* going to go down the "lots of people" route on the nature of perception and consciousness? Is that how you make your decisions on other subjects? I offered those links because they are thought-provoking and might encourage further research and reading - and experimentation. This is not an area where you can just go and read about "how it is". (In fact, I don't think there are many such areas.)

As you'll see, it's not clear what constitutes a "scientific experiment" in the field of consciousness, when there isn't actually a theory. We already have a similar problem with finding what matter "is", mind you.

Scientific Theory Side

Theorising on consciousness is *the* big open area. It's not just that we don't have a theory, it's that we have no idea what possible form a theory could take that will fit in with a materialist perspective - because we can't make the connection between 1st and 3rd person. Neuroscience is great stuff medically, but it keeps writing checks that it can't cash philosophically.

We often end up with "habits" (linking cosmological development to the big bang) or "promises" (it'll come out of brain research eventually, somehow) which just sit there as accepted ideas without having descriptive or predictive power. And even those that *do* are up for grabs. This is a classic area for this.

Most people just won't touch the subject, because it's a no-win in terms of your career. Still less people really care; it's something that'd be better if it went away. But those who are more established (or retired) do have a go. Christof Koch's aricle is worth a read although I think it is wrong; Donald Hoffman's ideas are interesting as mentioned before; Susan Greenfield has given some interesting talks but then she also comes out with other nonsense; Aeon magazine is a good resource for starting points; Bernardo Kastrup's aggressive writing is definitely worth the thought-provokation. You might also find Erwin Schrodinger's lectures, *What is Life?* Interesting. But essentially - unless there's a real flip-around of some sort, we're not going to be getting a consensus anytime soon. Cristof Koch's imaginary dialogue in *Scientific American* sums it up. Because - in the end, all brain-as-causation theories hit the same problem - at what point does consciousness "magically" emerge from matter, if matter does not already have a consciousness aspect? (Note, I do not mean *self-* or *reflective* consciousness. Just the property of awareness.)

In fact, you can keep all the "goodies" of physics and so on if you flip it round and insert a conscious background at the ground level, within which matter/phenomena arise as structured patterns.

Experiential Reality Side

Meanwhile, you can learn a lot just by examining your actual moment-to-moment experience. You *are* conscious, so why not explore the nature of that consciousness from its own perspective?

Studying brain blood-flow patterns via MRI can't really offer much insight into that. Neither does reading about today's temporary theories, or thinking *about* experience. You actually have to do the investigation yourself to get the 1st-person insights. And only then will you know what is required of a 3rd-person theory.

There's an abundance of material for this. Or you could try this little thought experiment (*Outside: The Dreaming Game*).

TL;DR: It ain't that simple, you're gonna have to do some work yourself, this is a "special topic" because it's not just about the sights, it's about the seeing. You need both the intellectual and the experiential aspect to make sense of it.

Convergence & The Man of One Book

> There is a saying: "Beware the man of one book".

A very wise saying! I'm totally stealing that. Similarly, beware the consensus view if you have not done the legwork yourself - or at least, *be aware* that you haven't. Take inspiration, I say, but keep it at arm's length.

> The nature of truth is that it's convergent. Loads of people will arrive at it independently regardless of era or geographical distance. Has this happened yet for the idea that consciousness creates reality?

I don't think I ever said that "consciousness creates reality"! Reality might be *made of* consciousness, but that is a different thing. If "matter" was taken as the substrate layer, would we say that "matter creates reality"?

On convergence: Many people have proposed the consciousness-as-substrate view in the past. It's always been there, over the last couple of hundred years, amongst philosophers. It didn't really matter to general physics/biology until relatively recently, when the insurmountable issue of explaining consciousness via matter came to the ore. It doesn't really make much difference for "physics involving stuff", it's still more of a philosophical thing mostly. The early 20th-century physicists (back when it was more "natural philosophy") all had things to say about it, but that kind of got forgotten about. Schrodinger, Planck, Pauli, Bohr - they all had interesting views which differ from the "science=technology development" angle we ended up with by the late 20th, even if they didn't integrate them.

Starting with work of the likes of David Bohm and *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*, his work with Basil Hiley, and culminating with an increasing number of articles by physicists on the topic in magazines like *Scientific American*, I think it's gradually become more prominent again.

Creation, Creator, Created

Meanwhile, we have to be very careful with the use of the word "creation" as a verb, a conscious act...

> > Moreover, I have done some simple experiments myself as you suggested and I cannot seem to instantiate objects or alter objects in front of me by thinking about it. How do you account for this?

...which is not to say it can't be done, eh. Those are definitely experiments everyone should try. What did you do, more specifically?

The idea that we can just sit in a chair and "think things into existence", as commonly understood, can quickly be disproven. Although we *can* think things into existence *over-here* (for that is what thoughts are) it doesn't necessarily mean we can think them into existence *over-there*. It *is* true that both thoughts and events "pattern" our minds as to the forms they will experience, though. In other words, we can be said to "create our experience", but the sense in which it is created means we'd be better to say something like "we can change the form of our experience". In the manner of, say, learning to see "trees" rather than brown patches topped off by green blobs. Or even "brown patches topped off by green blobs" rather than... nothingness.

The extent to which this means "creation" rather than "formatting" depends on whether you believe there is a deeper underlying solid reality (without evidence) or that patterns of consciousness that have become stabilised *is* that solid reality. Even if you could establish new forms, that doesn't mean you can just fly about or make millions of dollars appear under your bed. The world might have over time established very stable habits, deeply ingrained patterns which act as an effective potential barrier to this - such as the tendency of objects to move towards one another ("gravity"), and persistence in general ("inertia"). However, within the parameters of accumulated structuring, there certainly *are* things we can do just by "asking" or what we might call *thinking-over-there*. For instance, you can have your arm move. How do you do that?

> [Q: There's a lot of things I want to respond to in here, but I can't think of anything to say on the matter that won't irritate or upset you, and I don't want to do that. I do not foresee any possibility of constructive dialogue between us.]

Respond!

You won't irritate or upset me, trust me. I am far less bound to a particular viewpoint than you might imagine - I'm just setting out my stall as a starting point. Be as "straightforward" as suits you, also.

[...]

Great, now we're up and running ;-)

> This is astonishingly stupid. Only a retard would interpret this as evidence that consciousness creates reality.

I was careful to emphasise that I'm *not* saying that "consciousness creates reality". I'm suggesting that reality at the fundamental level is *made from* a material whose only property is consciousness. This isn't much different to saying it's made from "matter" - but it has the benefit that consciousness doesn't than have to magically "appear" at some point later. It's in-built. If you had followed *any* of the literature on consciousness studies over the last couple of decades even, you would be familiar with that approach as one of the possible solutions. If you are an appeal-to-authority kind of guy (which you seem to be) then you'll have to take the time to do some actual reading. If nothing else, read *Wholeness and the Implicate Order* or Paavo Pylkkanen's take on it.

> Your arm moves when you want it to because a direct electrical connection exists between your brain and that limb, which conveys the signal to move.

Really? Is that what *you do* when you get your arm to move? Right there is missing the point and the problem. Until we can connect the experience you *actually* have (I bet you've never experienced "direct electrical connections in your brain" ever) and the external observations, then there is a gap that needs to be bridge. These are some of the issues at the core of the consciousness problem.

You seem to not understand there is even something to explain!

> "What the @#$% Do We Know" is a textbook example of this, the scientists they interviewed were not told what the movie was really about.

Yeah, that was a terrible film... But the fact you even bring that up reveals something. I mean, nobody who actually is interested in these topics takes that seriously, right? Or even has a debate about it? It's like taking *The Matrix* as a documentary. So - I gave you a bundle of links to relevant articles by respected figures (is selected relevance "cherry picking"?) that offer the background you lack and are required to understand the problem and the potential solution, and you respond with a reference to *that* movie? I've referred you to no "new-age woo", as you put it. Or is it that you just automatically equate "consciousness" to a "woo topic" because it doesn't fit neatly into a conceptual framework? Your problem is that you don't know what you don't know. You are arguing about something you have spent zero time studying.

As Wolfgang Pauli would say: *You're not even wrong.*

Finally, you seem so very... *emotional* about all this. Why is that? It's fine if this is an uncomfortable topic for you; simply put it aside in that case. But don't fool yourself that there's no issue, that everything's solved, that we've got this sussed at the moment, etc. Science just isn't like that, it doesn't find Truth and never aims to. In ten years time, we might well look upon the idea of the Big Bang as a quaint mistake borne from an out-dated perspective.

> Requesting valid citations is not an appeal to authority. Somebody's book does not equal peer reviewed research.

This really is a false point. All of those authors have academic papers about their work; their books are based on it. However, you should be well-informed enough to judge what you read on its own merits. It's not beyond anyone to understand the issues here; it does not require advanced mathematics, for instance.

But, here is a good point - One of the criticisms that has been levied at theories relating to consciousness (and indeed alternate interpretations of quantum theory, the Bohmian approach included) is that it doesn't change the results, or predict different results - it changes the *description* of the results. For instance, is there an experiment we could do to prove that things are made from "matter"? No, because we measure the properties of something - not what something *is*, or the nature of our *experience* of it. We just don't care about this in a physical theory. But that's exactly the gap we need to tackle in this case.

> The idea that it is something separate and extricable from the brain rather than generated by it absolutely is woo.

Nobody is suggesting that, least of all me. The challenge is to have consciousness be *associated* with the brain without having to invoke some magical "emergence". In fact, we want consciousness to be "baked in" to reality before we even get to "brains". This is why Koch, Hoffman et al. have ended up changing tac to approach it from the other end, as it were.

> And what you call studying amounts to fruitcakes reading books by fruitcakes.

Really. So, you're saying that reading the work of physicists and philosophers and other thinkers, and using them as the basis of your own thinking, constitutes "fruitcakes & fruitcakes"?

It seems to me that you are a bit of a cherry-picker yourself - the ideas you like are legitimate, those you don't, aren't.

> What troubles me is that this is also what creationists say with respect to evolution. (That things aren't finalised.)

Creationists aren't pointing out that some things aren't explained, they just don't like the current explanation. The problem with consciousness is that it isn't explained with our current approach.

I can't help but think you are reading into what I say, assuming that I am taking a position that you happen to be particularly against. What I'm saying isn't particularly controversial as a possible approach:

- Consciousness - as experienced personally and as implied by observations externally - isn't currently accounted for in our description of the world.
- Until we can bridge the gap between my 1st-person experience of being and doing, with the 3rd-person observation of my body and actions, then our description of reality, biology and consciousness is not complete.
- The faith that consciousness is "emergent" at some point in brains seems unfounded and optimistic. Where is this magical moment? At what level of complexity? Is consciousness then a "thing" that is "made", rather than a property? If it is a property, why isn't it there all along?

- When I talk of "consciousness" I am not talking about self-conscious thinking. *That* would depend on the complexity of a structure. I am talking about the simple property of awareness, introducing it at ground level.
- This does *not* lead to "consciousness creates reality" in a new-age style. It does however mean that you can move your arm (by which I mean, your whole body can move itself as a single pattern, starting with brain activity). At the moment, we cannot explain how it is possible to move your arm - we can only describe the sequence of observations that constitute arm movement.

What are the problems here?

> Incidentally if I seem unreasonably harsh...

That's fine. It makes conversation a bit more efficient! ;-)

Wait... *pause*.

What exactly are we disagreeing about here? You seem to be assuming that I am suggesting that "science is not the way" and, like some sort of creationist, that some magic is responsible for our conscious experience and our world in general. In fact, I hold the opposite: That (neuro)science at the moment *involves* a sprinkling of magic dust at the last moment to make us conscious.

Problems??

I think neuroscience is, at the moment, super-basic and is talking up its book in the same way that genetics did back in the day (remember the certainty with which it was thought it was a "blueprint" with a gene for each property?) - most fMRI work seems to be a hack-job fishing expedition with "optimistic" statistics and an unsubtle "brain lighting up = this". This is somewhat of a funding-driven situation (I've been in similar situations in another scientific field.)

However, it will get better. I do believe the body and brain *is* the image of the person and their experience - "from the outside", as it were. Not in a particularly special way, in a similar sense I can tell a person's personality from their macroscopic behaviour. It's just a more detailed, granular view. So that's not the problem. Body-brain events correlate to an inner of events, quite so. To be clearer:

Body-brain events correspond to the CONTENT of my experience

The problem is, how do I link my personal "inner" experience of content to that "outer" observation? How is it that I *aware* of the content? How am I able to *manipulate* that content (e.g. create thoughts and move my body)? Those are the unanswered questions. No matter how detailed our description of the brain, we'll still need to tackle this, the "hard problem". Agreed?

Solutions??

And the suggested solution (this is where you get to slag me off and say it's rubbish, but please say *why* that is the case): If we incorporate "awareness" as a fundamental property of things from the start, then we just don't have the problem. Matter would not be *reflectively* aware but it would have "self-consciousness". Then there are no longer implicitly two separate things (consciousness and the body) with one causing the other or influencing the other. They become *the same thing*. Complex structures such as the brain-body will inherently experience themselves.

I *am* my body-brain - or at least a subset of it - and I move or think simply by moving myself, as myself. (Any *idea* about myself being a little controller somewhere is just a thought I have from time to time. Really "I" am the whole thing.)

To change my inner experience of myself *is identical* to acting and thinking. We've joined together the "inner theatre" and other "outer person"!

So that takes care of that. But we also get some stuff for free: An outcome of this is we get to move away from a strictly "parts" model of the universe. With a single background "property" that is everywhere, we can have nonlocal effects explained more easily. Our view becomes an *integrated*, *continuous* one.

IIT & CR/IT & AI

It would actually be better if there was a word that wasn't "consciousness" with all the baggage it brings with it. Which is where ideas like "integrated information" (Tononi) and the "interface model/conscious realism" (Hoffman) and "active information (Bohm) come in, although they are still build on awareness-as-inherent really. I pick on those authors because they are the most complete formulations that seem hopeful at formally integrating the different parts, even though I don't fully agree with them. I am not cherry-picking - honest! ;-)

(The Tononi papers on IIT are a bit of a slog although it's worth reading the update. Scott Aaronson's blog entry on it is good though. Less sophisticated, the overview, but it adds: "Consciousness is a fundamental property of the universe. Wherever there is integrated information, there is experience.")

[...]

Just passing this thread again: A recent conversation reminded me that Henry Stapp - worked with Pauli and Heisenberg - is good on this. His book *Mindful Universe* is worthwhile, but actually the introductory chapters of *Mind, Matter and Quantum Mechanics* pretty much covers it all, although a bit dense.

> [Stapp's interpretation of Quantum Theory is that there are many knowers. Each knower's act of knowledge (each individual increment of knowledge) results in a new state of the universe. One person's increment of knowledge changes the state of the entire universe, and, of course, it changes it for everybody else. Quantum Theory is not about the behavior of matter, but about our knowledge of such behavior.]

Basically, **it's a *mental* universe.**

Anyway, that's that. Cheers!

Reply to “When do you call bullshit?”

Things are useful, or not. Or fun, or not. I'll happily enjoy any way of looking at things for a while, because often it can't make your world seem more interesting and exciting - dream kicks! - and just adopting a view does have effects. Nothing is *completely* bullshit, but nothing is really true either.

Fundamentally, the only thing you can be sure of it that you are experiencing what you are experiencing. Everything else is up for grabs. But if anyone talks of "the nature of reality" in terms of some sort of new "building block" or relationship, then that needs to be given a wide berth.

The hipster-hippie crowd usually know the best coffee shops though. Sometimes that's worth enduring a crystal conversation or two, surely. ;-)

> I think the answer is to use the ideas without **becoming** them.

That's great.

Reply to “Bill Murray gives a surprising and meaningful answer you might not expect.”

> What does it mean to be "here"? To focus on your visual experience? To focus on SOUND? To focus on the air on your nose? Is being "here" meaning NOT imagining things?

I'd say it's to be aware of yourself as the background *context* to whatever the *content* of experience is. By "background" I literally mean that "open aware space" or "perceptual space" that you are, in which your sensory experiences ("the world") and shadow-sensory experiences ("your thoughts") arise.

It's okay to have thoughts and imaginings, so long as you are not narrowed on them - thoughts are just as much "now" as anything else. Conversely, being narrowed on an aspect of sensory experience such that you find yourself 'waking up' when that attention releases - for instance, being spatially concentrated in your attention while reading this message - is also being lost.

In fact, I think a problem a lot of us suffer from, is that we've conflated *intending* something with *narrowing our attention* on it - perhaps because it gives us a sense of "doing" - and over time that narrowing becomes more entrenched and the subsequent release much slower. But we don't need to do this at all.

For example, to read the text on this screen, you do not have to deliberately focus or concentrate or manipulate your attention onto it, you can actually stay open and simply *intend* to read it, and then let the reading "happen" - allowing attention to shift by itself, in the most appropriate way.

A similar lesson applies to physical movements: you do not need to manipulate and control your muscles "manually" in order to stand up from seated position, for example; simply intending and allowing the body to move, is sufficient. (Although if you've built up a long term habit of starting a movement by "re-asserting your current position", it may take a little while to feel out what it's like to "allow" this to happen.)

Reply to “How do you define ego?”

[[Q: I think Aldous Huxley's interpretation of it is the best.

"Each person is at each moment capable of remembering all that has ever happened to him and of perceiving everything that is happening everywhere in the universe. The function of the brain and nervous system is to protect us from being overwhelmed and confused by this mass of largely useless and irrelevant knowledge, by shutting out most of what we should otherwise perceive or remember at any moment, and leaving only that which is likely to be practically useful. According to such a theory, each one of us is potentially Mind at Large. But in so far as we are animals, our business is at all costs to survive. To make biological survival possible, Mind at Large had to be funneled through the reducing valve of the brain and nervous system What comes out the other end is a measly trickle of the kind of consciousness which will help us to stay alive on the surface of this particular planet."

- from The Doors of Perception.]]

It's a good quote, but it reminds me of the problem I had with it at the time I read it: If we are "Mind At Large", then in what sense are we funnelled through nervous systems and brains? Maybe we could say we "take on the experience of being" brains, take on that shape, but that's it. In other words, we are not people using brains as a filtering mechanism against Mind - we are Mind imagining ourselves to be people, with the brain a *representation* of our state.

Magick is then an approach by which we *re-imagine* our person-world. All states and experiences are always available for this process. It's a shifting of attention, therefore, rather than a transformation?

Reply to “What is non-duality/headlessness?”

Headlessness is Douglas Harding's approach to realising the actual nature of your experience. I recommend Rupert Spira for exploring non-duality.

> From what I understood, we don't experience non-duality because we see life in 1st person. If we try to imagine experiencing life in the 3rd person, we see that there is not really an observer.

No, it's the other way around really.

Our *direct 1st person experience* is non-dual - it consists only of consciousness. That is the insight. The problems we encounter in understanding experience are precisely due to our tendency to *imagine it* in the 3rd person. Basically, we tend to *think-about* our experience rather than *directly-explore* it.

You might like the Imagination Room metaphor as a way of helping you play with this.

The short version:

- Your actual experience is of being a "big open aware space" in which sensations, thoughts, and perceptions appear and disappear. When we think about our experience, we tend to *imagine* on top of this, that we are a brain and a body and a person. But actually we don't experience those things.
- You can realise this by directing your attention at "where you are looking out from". Simply point your finger at your face, and follow the direction it is pointing in. What is there? A big open space! There is no "you" there. Your body is empty! Then you notice that this "space" extends infinitely in all directions - you cannot feel a boundary in it anywhere.

TL;DR: It's all about realising that you experience yourself as unbounded consciousness with no "outside", and all the world appears "within" that, as you.

Reply to “The mind is so complicated”

Thoughts...

Any pattern you discover is just... another pattern you've discovered. The more you look, the more you create-discover. Whenever you adopt a particular outlook or conceptual framework, your world will appear to fall in line with it to a greater or lesser extent: "mind-formatting by metaphor". The form of the world as experienced = the form of your mind. **You experience yourself.** Trying to get to 'the bottom of it' is just creating more ripples in the pool of water, obscuring what is underneath.

To truly understand something is to *know* it directly. If you want to know the texture of something, you don't think about it - you touch it, quietly. You have to let such knowledge come to you, arise within you.

Reply to “My problem with most reality theories”

> It is my opinion that existence does not operate in any definable manner at all, we cannot postulate on existence by taking the laws and parameters that we believe govern our subjective experience of reality and assume that the rest of existence is in any way related to those laws and parameters.

The core problem is that experience leaves traces and those traces in-form subsequent experiences. We cannot separate the structure of mind from the apparent structure of experience. Mainly because, to us, they are one and the same thing.

> And finally occam's razor, the simplest explanation to me for things existing, is that they don't.

In a sense. "Exist" is difficult - perhaps better to say they don't exist in the sense that our typical world-description would assume. We can't "represent" existence, because either both the existence and the representation occur within the same field of observation, or we use the term existence to represent *everything*, which is meaningless.

> Thanks for the reply, I'm glad you understand the difficulty and inherent problems with trying to communicate something like this.

It's difficult, but I think so long as the people having a conversation *understand* that it's difficult (i.e. don't get frustrated at each other because it's so obvious to them) then they can feel their way along.

> existing/not existing are not singular states even if they are both definable to an extent.

Yes.

So, a shadow 'exists' but it does not exist in the sense of being a separate thing to the object that casts the shadow. It would be tempting to say that the object is 'more real' than the shadow. But actually neither the object nor the shadow 'exist' without the light source which makes them both visible, so it is relative. From the perspective of the light source, the shadow and object are equally real.

Yeah, wishy-washy pretty fast! :-)

> For instance if you hypothetically could draw a diagram representation, how do you include your perspective of the representation within the representation...

It gets pretty folded, pretty quickly - infinite regression. Right, we have to declare one "observational level" as the foundation. I think we can do this. It's time for today's made-up metaphor! I think it's something like this:

Today's Metaphor: The Single Sheet of Paper

I have a sheet of paper. It has a line dividing it into two, and on the left side is a picture of a vivid 3D cube drawn in amazing technicolour. The right side is blank. The right side is where I can draw to think, represent. However, my drawing skills aren't that great (I can only do 2D) and my tools limited (only got red and blue crayons). But I draw the best *representation* that I can: a blue and red square.

Okay, now I think to myself: I've represented the cube, how about I represent my representation? To do this, I don't need another level or whatever. I simply draw another blue and red square on the right side, with a little arrow pointing to the first square I drew. On the left we have "the external world". On the right we have "my thoughts about the external world" and "my thoughts about my thoughts". No infinite regress. I can have as many "thoughts about thoughts" as I like without going to a deeper level.

Importantly, all of this happens on *the same single sheet of paper*. **My aware space. My mind.**

> I feel compelled to mention I'm by no means as well read as a lot of people here, and what I write is pure conjecture, so there are bound to be contradictions/inconsistencies floating around

:-)

Being well-read just means you have read more. Being good at reading, being good at thinking-about-thinking is no guarantee of insight. More important to be open and curious.

After all, it might be that the world we experience is *inherently inconsistent*. Then all those neatnik little reader-thinker folk would be screwed, wouldn't they? ;-)

[...]

> It's starting to drive me crazy, that there are NO substantive posts with a feasible, logical, rational structure to them.

Well, lots of people are just trying and struggling to put their experiences into words - and often finding that they don't quite fit. Also, they are sometimes trying to describe something which is *before* logic and reasoning: That which experiences logic and reasoning (and absurdity and intuition and everything else). They are trying to describe what experiences are "made from", but you can't get outside experience in order to do this, and it's meaningless to talk of logical representations of an experience of void, say.

Although I'd agree that you have to go one way or the other - half-logic is no path at all.

> Experience only can come from a background of pure logic and reason underlying the very fabric of reality.

I disagree. Logic and reason aren't the base, the underlying fabric of reality. They are certainly patterns or pathways which experience *may* flow along - by which I mean both thought and perception - and they might even be some of the most stable pathways, but they only seem to be the foundation because they are common and become entrenched due to repeated activation.

They are hard to describe in words, yes, because they are more subtle than words - words are "too late". But they at least do correspond somewhat with the structure of language, and so can be captured to some extent.

Which is why they get confused with the basic level of reality - because they can be *thought about* and more subtle structures can't because they barely correspond to language at all. (This also means they become disproportionately reinforced by communication.)

Logical pathways might be "lowest common denominator" pathways. If every experience we have leaves a memory trace in our minds, which then funnels subsequent experience in a self-reinforcing cycle, then it would seem as if reality was built upon those pathways. They would seem to be external laws.

In fact, though, this would be equivalent to simply thinking about something an awful lot ("red cars"), subsequently noticing those things after being so primed (red cars in the street), thinking about them some more ("gosh, lots of red cars"), in a passive loop. It would seem that reality was built a certain way, when in fact the 'shape of your mind' had been deformed. You could never tell the difference. In fact, there would be no difference...

It could be argued that surely only patterns that were common "out there" could lead to such stable patterns, and so patterns of mind == patterns of external reality, but there would be no way to test this. We can't point to external reality - where is it? In some parallel space beyond this room? Where is the real hand that could do the pointing anyway?

After all, when did we "wake up" and start thinking about this stuff? Who knows what patterns have been accumulated before then! If we are all one, then really there is only one mind anyway, and so there need be *no* fundamental solid underlying *at all*. Just, accumulated patterns from a random noise, eventually clustering into meaningless paths, from which our arbitrary world emerged. It seems meaningful, but only because "meaning" arose by the same process.

All you have to experiment with, is the flexibility of your own experience. No maybes. ;-)

I disagree that we are analogue computers. "Minds" is just a word we use to (fictionally) encapsulate a set of experiences when we talk about them.

> > We think about thinking, but we don't even know what a thought really is. It isn't 'anything' more than a pattern.

It isn't any-*thing*, that's true. And it is a pattern. But following the input-execute analogy doesn't really lead us anywhere surely. There's no evidence for it in our experience, for starters, it's just a visualisation that some people find attractive. Although your (implied) notion patterns unfolding spontaneously along "the curve" is a nice description.

> > [Q: There's no evidence for input-execute in our experience? What? Go read a neuroscience book, or hell, even just an informative article, you fucking hippie scum... srsly jesus christ. ew. so glad i don't reject anything that has 'weight' to it. you just write off everything because everything 'is nothing' in your view. Have fun with that crap, m8. I'd like to see the kind of moral code you've built up for yourself with that attitude... Or maybe I don't want to see it, because it's probably abhorrent.]

Somebody got out of bed the wrong way? ;-)

Maybe *you* need to spend a bit more time reading critically and also paying attention to how you actually experience the world. Neuroscience, despite its many advances in other areas, has made very little progress when it comes to understanding how we come to perceive a "world" or the larger area of consciousness. We might be able to track brain activity from eye to brain, but we don't see "processing" of that into a "world". And it's hard to see how it ever could at present. There are currently *no* theories about how consciousness arises. The signal-path/processing/construction metaphor just doesn't seem to work any better than the clockwork metaphor or the steam metaphor before it. We can't even locate memories in the brain. There's interesting stuff going on, but it mainly reveals how little progress we've made. But the way that minimal progress becomes turned into blanket enthusiasm and even public policy is somewhat dubious.

That there is a link between brain and experience is certain, but the nature of that connection is... hazy to say the least. For all we can tell, we might be the equivalent of *The Electric Ant*.

Donald Hoffman's interface theory of perception is perhaps one of the more hopeful approaches. The problem remains that the brain as studied is itself a representation in mind, and we have a terrible habit of literally seeing our metaphors without recognising it. (Hence it being important to bear in mind that the "objects" we divide experience into aren't necessarily "out there". Wherever that is.)

Meanwhile, physicists (the late) David Bohm and Basil Hiley's work on wholeness and the implicate order is an interesting approach.

The short version: Current models and metaphors are crap; they don't fit our experiences; we need to explore the nature of perception - and hence the apparent world - more; the future of neuroscience as an explanatory approach is just faith.

My moral code: Is probably much more inclusive and considerate than someone who thinks we live in a world where "there aren't 'minds' at all" and other people are just "analogue computers which perform i/o".

> Consciousness can't be described because it isn't a thing.

I would agree with that statement (although perhaps not in the way you meant it).

> We think we are conscious, but what convinced you of that?

This is mistaken. It is independent of thinking.

Sure, I can think, "I am conscious" but that's just a thought - but it is a thought *within my awareness*. By attending to the space around that thought, or the context of my experience more generally, I discover that I *directly experience right now* that I am aware. Or more correctly in this first-person view, that I *am* this awareness.

I don't think this is something that can be thought *about* (because thoughts appear within and are made from this; consciousness is not an object). But it is a direct truth.

> Why do people emphasize the fact we can perceive consciouslly?

Because it is their fundamental experience and any description of the world which does not account for it (or at least admit to starting from it) is incomplete.

The phrasing "we perceive consciously" is problematic perhaps. Perceptions appear to us; we don't "do" perception. We must account for this also. Perception might be "ordinary" in the sense of being familiar and ever-present, but that does not mean it needs no examination. Quite the contrary.

Right now you are sat in front of a screen, reading this text. If you sit back, you can feel the space in the room, become aware of all its contents. Simultaneously, you experience a sense of the place you are "looking out from". Also, any thoughts which are arising, any body sensations. Additionally, you can now *think-about* those these experiences. Behind all that, there is a sense of "presence".

Now, you can think the words "I am just a computer, this is all programmed". But this really doesn't account for the experience at all. What I'm doing is replacing experience with a thought *about* it.

(And the more you take the time to examine your experience, the more you'll discover there's lots of other stuff going on. Exploring how actions and thoughts happen, how experiences snap into formations, and how adopting a certain set of ideas actually changes your actual perceptions.)

> As for moral code, if we are all computers executing code, then we can never blame ourselves but rather only the situation in which code was executed. Can't be mad at people, ever, with that worldview.

If we are all "computers executing code", then we have no *choice* whether to blame ourselves, or be made at people, or not - or indeed anything. There is a quick cheat to all this, of course: You can insert "consciousness" as the base level material in the universe and have everything else as "patterns of consciousness".

(Christof Koch's panpsychism does take a half step there, but not quite because he hold onto a certain notion of consciousness-and-object. Many otherwise interesting formulations stumble by confusing the *content* of consciousness with *consciousness* itself. Also, confusions between consciousness, self-consciousness, awareness and attention persist.)

> What makes you convinced you are 'aware'? Isn't that one of those symbols your mind made up?

You highlight an important point, you get to the essence of this.

-- It is simply directly true that awareness is my experience; it is experience itself. --

It is not symbolic. This is different to *thinking about* being aware.

We could maybe say there are two types of truth:

- ***Direct Truth.***

  I touch a pillow. The pillow is soft. It is directly true that I am having the experience of softness. Or rather, that softness is my experience. The feeling of "direct sensation". Although I am using words to describe this, I stress that this experience is not itself symbolic.

- ***Conceptual Truth.***

  This is the truth of a coherent system of thought. A set of thoughts which fit together. That is conceptual, logical or symbolic truth. The "feeling" of an argument "making sense". Note that a conceptual framework can be entirely self-consistent, have this feeling associated with it, and yet be largely disconnected with perceptual experience, the direct facts of the world.

Both experiences occur within the same "conscious space". Being aware is the direct truth of the background sensation in which other experiences (direct perceptions *and* thoughts) appear.

It is difficult to talk about this though, because not only is it not symbolic (it can't be experienced as *Conceptual Truth*), it is also not an object (so it is a *Direct Truth* but without a "thing" I can attach it to, unlike the pillow). Rather, it is the background which takes on the shape of those experiences, the context and the material for experiential objects.

Excuse the struggle for wording there; it's the nature of the topic!

[...]

No Mechanism: Awareness & Content

> saying that awareness is the 'background' means that anything can be aware without a mechanism of awareness...

Yes. Awareness itself can be taken for granted. There is no mechanism. In fact, logically, it the only way to get things to work. The *content and structure of experience* is something else though. Our wormy friend isn't having the same sort of experience as us. However, his *background* and the *nature* of his experience is the same. Remember, by "awareness" I mean literally just "being aware". This is not about self-reflection or thought associations or whatever.

No Connection: Awareness & Space-Time

> it's not connecting to this universal hyperfabric of awareness that permeates through everything...

There is no connection to anything. Do waves have to "connect" to the water? (Excuse me reusing a hackneyed metaphor.)

In a way, there is nothing special about this. We could ask "what is matter made from"? And hit the same problems. You might eventually answer something like "it is patterns formed by the bending of space-time". Well, maybe think of a base material whose only property is that of being-aware. That's all it does. If we "fold" that material into shapes, then we have awareness-experiencing-a-folded-shape. The more complex the shapes...

Well, this is basically the "matter/space-time" story, but with consciousness built in, inserted at the fundamental level. We get all the goodies of science, but no mind-body problem.

> I guess doing drugs and thinking 'outside the box' can lead people to that conclusion, but what basis is there?

I think what happens in those experiences is that the habitual structures of mind relax somewhat, and the feeling of 'open awareness' or 'open space' becomes more apparent because it is less clouded. Like those figure/ground illustrations.



No Built-In Structure: Emergent Stability

> I guess my final statement is this: why are things differential if there isn't some sort of inherent logical structure built into reality? what would have caused reality to develop the structure which allows this universal awareness that is everything/everywhere to exist?

As hinted above, we have to take "open unstructured awareness" as the starting point. This starting point is, remember, *before* divisions of any sort. We might use the metaphor of a blanket which then gets folded into patterns, but of course that implies a spatiality that awareness does not possess: it is not a "thing", it is formless. But things may be formed within it, but at the same time it will always remain unbroken.

It has no structure; it is before structure. Therefore it is inherently everything, everywhere, always.

Taking that starting point, we can then allow the universe to come into being quite straightforwardly. Perhaps using a simple model of random fluctuations appearing, which then cluster into patterns, which self-reinforce and form more persistent structures - habits, if you will. Regularities. You could even call them "laws".

And so there comes to be a feedback mechanism: Patterns arise, leaving traces, which funnel future patterns, and so the universe tends towards stability. This applies to the universe at large, but also to our own localised experiences - and in fact those turn out to be identical.

In effect, we only need one type of metaphor to describe everything. We have:

- A "landscape" of awareness upon which the "rain" of random fluctuations falls.
- The rain erodes the landscape, leading to channels, which channels future rain.
- Before you know it, you've got a highly complex, stable world, but still with an inherent creativity and a possibility of change.

No Worries: Thoughts & Intentions

There's an additional component of *intention* and individual minds - by which I just mean localised areas of awareness - but even that follows the same mechanism: Thoughts would leave traces too, explaining why adopting a viewpoint appears to deform one's direct experience. This accounts for our tendency to 'see what we believe' - repetitive thinking, or thinking while in a certain type of open mode, literally restructures our mind. (It's reasonable to ask "where is that structure?" - and it is in fact directly accessible, it's just subtle compared with the ongoing foreground experience of sounds & sights & thoughts.)

Intention might therefore be described as a "wilful deformation" of the patterns within awareness.

> 'localised areas of awareness' - I thought your whole point was that everything is aware... how can it be localized then?

Everything is aware, it is continuous and delocalised. Patterns, however, are not. The "sky" is everywhere, a particular "cloud" is not.

> In your analogy: the landscape, the awareness untouched, it has these random fluctuations, but somehow these are separate from the landscape while also being a part of the landscape, eroding the landscape.

It's all made of the same thing. It's just a metaphor to illustrate the evolution of the world. To use words, you have to partition things up unfortunately. But it's quite hard to describe a self-fluctuating, self-memorising, self-experiencing, aware surface that has no sides or edges and is therefore not even a surface initially. ;-)

> The landscape HAD topology on it already, and the 'random rain' which carves out those rivers was always going to carve out the same rivers, because of the starting topology.

Really?

In my description, all that I pre-suppose is the property of awareness + the appearance of random fluctuation. Absolutely everything else follows from that, and leads to the stable world, one with physical laws and populated with conscious beings, we find ourselves in today.

You are now suggesting we start with a pre-made topology, with everything rolling down it! So, how did this topology come to be? And how did the "snowball" come to be, and arrive at its initial location?

Basically, you are saying that space-time and the laws of physics are fundamental and have always existed, right That just seems a bit... unlikely! ;-)

If you like, I'll let you call the point where the first object appears "the Big Bang" or something like that. Would that make my description more appealing to you? :-)

> And yes, I am suggesting a premade topology, because in YOUR example, the rivers wouldn't form without a nook and cranny to actually erode.

You are wrong. Which is why I included that little clustering animation. Since "random" doesn't mean "evenly distributed", paths will form on such a metaphorical "memory surface". No nooks and crannies required.

> Rehashing again (because you don't seem to get this point I've been making the whole damn time... like talking to a wall), things 'are', they aren't 'not'. With that in mind, it isn't a leap to say all things that 'are', are, and that's it.

Oh, but it's a massive leap and it's a cheat. It's giving up, basically. We could have done that at any point in the past. Perhaps we could have just said: Hey, here's planet Earth, it just "is". But we didn't. You are suggesting we go: Hey, here are physical laws, they just "are"'. Why? You can push past that.

Eventually you get to "is-ness" itself. Even that doesn't need to be accepted, you can go beyond it: "is" and "is not" are not fundamental. In fact you have to go beyond this, because that's the only way to account for consciousness, and any scheme which leaves that out is incomplete.

I understand your point about not being able to access beyond the "cone" - that we cannot reach out beyond the rippling-out, beyond the unfurling edge of this "pattern" - but this turns out to not be important when all patterns have the same origin.

The way your own mind works is exactly the same way the whole universe works. And of course it is! How could it be otherwise? All talk of "software" is already "too late". It's a pretty unambitious base level to set ourselves when it comes to deeper explanations. Fun at a high level, sure, and very useful, but it's not "the nature of things".

The universe is not made out of code, our of inferred laws, or out of mathematics. When we observe those things, we're really just observing the structure of our own minds...

> ...it's that those laws of physics and space-time CAN be known... ... the preloaded mechanics of reality boils down to things that 'can' be known...

...which is basically what you say here. When we talk about conceptual schemes (laws and so on) we're not really talking about the universe "out there" at all.

Reply to “When I'm mindful of the present moment, ideas flow more freely, and they're more powerful. Why is this?”

We confuse how things work, perhaps.

Trying to think out something, to generate an idea or solve a problem, is basically you *holding onto* thought and making it flow along certain paths. This actually blocks what you are trying to do.

Actually, you want to 'ask and receive'. Let the thoughts come to you. If you have a problem to solve, ponder it in detail with the intention to reach a solution, and release it. That thought structure (the description of the problem) will evolve itself into the solution, and then come back into your attention.

It's similar to the way you can improve your perception of the world around you. Instead of *trying* to see and hear and feel, grasping with the senses via narrowing attention, you should "let the world come to you" - rest as the open space of awareness, and allow the world to arise within that space by itself.

Reply to “Your subconscious is smarter than you might think”

I suggest that thoughts are their own things, and that ***problems solve themselves.***

Problems, as described in thought, are created with the intention of being solved, and so their natural tendency is to do so. Create them (formulate the problem), *leave them alone*, and that thought framework will come back to you in the form of the answer. It seems mystifying to us because we assume that "we" actually *do* things. It's actually probably more accurate to say that we *set targets*, and the rest of it happens *to* use as experiences, as the world walks the path towards those targets.

It's only the tendency we have to not entirely let go to this process which results in a sense of opposition and tension - or *effort* - and the feeling that we *do and try* instead of *have an experience*.

Meanwhile - the so-called subconscious isn't really outside consciousness, it's just not expanded as a sensory experience. It's a *felt-sense* that's always there. Just because it's not explicitly being encountered as "objects and sense modalities" doesn't it isn't there at all, enfolded into the background space.

Reply to “What do you guys think about Eckhart Tolle?”

Maybe our idea of what "walking the walk" entails is misguided. **Non-duality isn't about behaviour, it's about a simple fact**: At the fundamental level, there is no separation or division, there is just the nonmaterial material whose only property is *being-aware*. Everything else exists only as patterns in that awareness.

As a result of this understanding, we *might* then conclude there are appropriate behaviours - because "we are all one" - but those are extra ideas on top. The fundamental reality itself doesn't care what patterns appear within it. Realising the non-dual nature might result in feeling connected with all of reality and humanity "as you", but your experience is still patterned as a *human* experience.

Just as materialists don't necessarily go about actually acting as if they were inert matter with no empathy, non-dualists don't necessarily go about being messiah-like. They are not an example to us all, "they" are just another temporary pattern in awareness.

> This interpretation seems to abandon the need for any ethics.

From the fundamental viewpoint, **there is no such thing**. But then, from the fundamental viewpoint, **there isn't *anything***.

There is the property of connectedness *of all people* at the fundamental level, so we would expect an increased natural compassion for others in someone with more "insight". But with this would come a recognition that there *are* divisions at the human level, and that they are resolved by constant rebalancing. If everyone identified completely with the whole (the 'ethics of the continuum'), there would be no distinctions, and therefore no wars (nothing and nobody to fight) and so on. Also in effect, no people! But for as long as there are distinctions, then there is division and opposition...

And the environment - together with our human need for food and water - will create distinction and therefore opposition, even if we do not. Ethics, then, are the human "customs, habits" associated with a particular distinction (group), a particular worldview, geared towards the persistence of that distinction (group).

> > With this logic, it seems as if Hitler could have the same presence of mind as Tolle. Interesting indeed.

Hitler is just as much a part of "the one" as Tolle, and neither is evil from their own perspective. In fact, one extreme can only be discerned relative to the other; they are part of the ongoing rebalancing process, a destabilised object oscillation to a rest position. I would hope Tolle feels a more general compassion than Hitler did though, that his worldview encompasses more people.

However, if Tolle found himself in a cage fight, would he resort to violence?

> > I think this brings up the question of "attachment" . . . only the relinquishing of attachment gets you to the real shit.

Well, this is true. You release your hold on narrowed attention, let it open out and deepen to encompass everything. You become the entire world, universe, the real deal... at which point patterns fade, you become only the continuum, and you will think it is absolutely perfect as it is.

What you've learned is that to have an experience, requires a division. If you have a division, you have opposition. If you have opposition, you have conflict.

The recognition of this means you no longer feel you have to *fight* the conflict, not that it disappears. It becomes sort of "transparent" and you can see through it. You realise that it's okay to go swimming even if the water has ripples in it, because otherwise there would be no water in which to swim.

This is where "acceptance" comes in, I guess.

> I wonder if it's possible to be both attached and detached at the same time? I know some meditative dudes claim to maintain "split consciousness," where they are simultaneously, say, carrying on a conversation with you and repeating a mantra in order to ground themselves.

Well, I'm not a fan of that "mantra" stuff, but I certainly think you can have multiple patterns arising in your awareness at once that don't necessarily form a continuous space. You do it all the time, in fact, by looking around you while a thought appears. The thought seems somehow to be *parallel-simulataneous* - occurring at the same time but no in the same "perceptual space".

Normally we flip perspectives - you can do it right now: Just decide to "become" the space in the room, including the volume of space your body occupies. Now "become" your body again. And so on.

From there, you can experience everything as just being "made from the background awareness".

How does this then relate to our enlightened folk and their action in the world? Well, I'm not quite sure about this.

If you ponder it, there is the fundamental situation (the nonmaterial material) and there is the *arbitrary* patterns within it. Anything at all that is not the fundamental is pattern-based, and therefore specific to the forms/habits underlying our experience.

So-called "wisdom" is then relative. It's just a case of which granularity, which level of subtly, you are speaking from in terms of the patterning.

> And yeah, if you identify completely with the whole, then I agree you don't exist at all.

Right. The most subtle patterns will be simple properties, then concepts, such as "relative division" and "spatial extent" and then "perimeter". These will be *felt-known*. Much later, there might be concepts of "image" and "sound" and "texture". We haven't even got to "object" yet...

It is all very well to say that the true reality is "love" - by which people mean the unbounded openness of *being-aware* - but while you are a human you have certain baseline structures in your experience that dissolving will mean, if not death, then a ceasing of this-world in perception. *Recognition* is good, but its primary result is probably the reduction of fear? And maybe increased possibilities...

Extra topic: Does "acceptance" mean literally accepting things as they are, even if this knowledge implies a new-found *flexibility* to reality which suggests we could affect it in direct ways?

Reply to “How do I know you exist?”

> Solipsism

That's only a problem if we're talking about a *personal* mind. If he realises that *he* doesn't exist (as a person) either, then solipsism isn't a hurdle.

[...]

> > Get out of your head, go outside, experience reality, and you'll see there is so much more to life than just yourself.

Can he get out of his head?
Where *is* this "outside"?
Maybe *all* of life is "just" himself.
Not little him who worries about what to have for dinner, but the larger him.

If all these things don't exist for his amusement, what *do* they exist for?

> > [Q: I feel like there's a whole bunch of people in this thread just fucking with this poor guy at this point. He came here asking a serious question that is obviously causing him a lot of anxiety and instead of replying with the simple answer, 'Chill out. We exist too.' You all decide to fuck with him by saying 'I dunno, I might exist, I might not, nothing is real' etc. There's a time for being philosophical and questioning the nature of reality and the universe and there's a time to get your head out of your ass and just talk straight. Are you seriously saying WE and the entire universe exist for HIS sole amusement? If true, that has got to be the most egotistical statement I've ever heard.]

You have a point - I don't think he was taken particularly seriously. Unfortunately intersubjectivity is the *trickiest* topic when it comes to consciousness and experience. It's not easy to talk straight about.

The quick answer is that everything that you experience it real-at-what-it-is.

You experience others as having presence and intelligence; that is sufficient evidence.

Life is definitely simpler if you just accept that and go out and enjoy it.

Right? But, if we can't let it go, if someone really wants to explore it... Just because you have access to your thoughts and not people's thoughts (note, *not* "other" people) doesn't mean you are on a different level of existence. When you really pay attention you find that, reassuringly, you are not really a "person" you are *aware* of a person - in the same way you are *aware* of "other people".

And that is how experience can be centred around your perspective, while avoiding being self-centred (solipsistic). You can now relax and enjoy your life from the perspective of a background awareness rather than a tensed-up human.

> > > Are you seriously saying WE and the entire universe exist for HIS sole amusement? If true, that has got to be the most egotistical statement I've ever heard.

If he really embraced that point of view then it would be the *opposite* of egotistical, and it wouldn't be about amusement.

If you realised that the whole world was in fact "your extended body and mind", then you'd be very kind to it. To do otherwise, to play with aspects of it non-seriously, would be like taking fire to you own arms.

And it wouldn't be an egotistical notion, because such a view would *annihilate* the ego - there would be no places for a localised, separate sense of self, right?

TL;DR: He can know we exist because he experiences us with a corresponding intelligence. However, the deeper answer involves revisiting what he thinks *he* is and *we* are in such a way as to place himself at the centre while changing the understanding of the himself to avoid solipsism.

Reply to “[serious] Do you believe that free will exists?”

The point is really that your decisions should be the *best decisions possible*. You don't *want* to be free to do just anything random, you want to be free to do "the best thing".

That involves having the most information, the most accurate and comprehensive information, feeding into your decisions. If you focus on the mind, you will make decisions based on theory. If you focus on the body, you will make decisions based on emotion. If you expand your awareness to "all that is", though, then your decisions will take into account everything: the universe.

So really the only decision you ever need to make is to say "yes" to letting go, releasing your narrow attention, and letting the universe act through you - because that is going to be the best decision, the ideal path anyway.

From the Richard Linklater film *Waking Life*:

> [Actually, there's only one instant, and it's right now, and it's eternity. And it's an instant in which God is posing a question, and that question is basically, 'Do you want to, you know, be one with eternity? Do you want to be in heaven?' And we're all saying, 'No thank you. Not just yet.' And so time is actually just this constant saying 'No' to God's invitation. I mean that's what time is. I mean, and it's no more 50 A.D. than it's two thousand and one. And there's just this one instant, and that's what we're always in.
>
> ...actually this is the narrative of everyone's life. That, you know, behind the phenomenal difference, there is but one story, and that's the story of moving from the "no" to the "yes." All of life is like, "No thank you. No thank you. No thank you." then ultimately it's, "Yes, I give in. Yes, I accept. Yes, I embrace." I mean, that's the journey. I mean, everyone gets to the "yes" in the end, right?]

TL;DR: Do I have a choice?

Reply to “Isn't our inability to recognize dreams from within, reason to question our beliefs of what is real?”

> > We all have evidence that we are inept at distinguishing dream from reality. We have all forgotten ourselves within a dream.

Yes! :-)

> > Are you suggesting that realities are interchangeable, like video games in a console? If so, why play this game? I can imagine a more enjoyable experience.

I'm suggesting, mainly, that your experience is that of being an open aware space, with content arising within it - including the dream character you call "you" - and that dreams and waking life therefore seem to be on the same level - rather than dreams being in the Russian Doll of waking life.

So, when this waking life experience fades out, another one might fade in.

Why this "game"? It seems part of the design of this game is that we don't get to remember what we were playing before, and why we chose it. I suspect that's because it makes it more exciting - to think that it's "really real". Of course, lots of us twig at some point during play that all is not as it seems. We never are in danger after all.

[...]

> > [Q: If I suddenly found out that none of this was real I would just go sit somewhere until I "died." Refusal and all of that. I imagine if all of this wasn't real there would be some sort of being who is at a higher level. I'd basically just be saying "no" to them while hoping I persist through whatever long enough to meet them and ask "what the fuck were you thinking?"
>
> > I should mention when I say "found out that none of this was real" I mean that I was told that it is not real. How else could you know for sure?]

It *is* "real" - it just isn't "real" in the way you previously thought. For instance, thoughts are "real" thoughts, apparent objects are "real" apparent objects. It's just that they are only made of sensations; there's no "solid, external world" behind it. *Your theory was wrong, that's all.*

It is in this sense that this is a dream - and that the world around you (a dream environment) and your apparent self (a dream figure) are "dream objects", made only of "mind". You are actually the background to this experience, not the content.

Do you really only continue to live because you think this is real in some solid way? Can you not enjoy experiences for what they are, not for what you think they could be? Ever had a lucid dream? You realise you a dreaming while in a dream and now, free of fear and with the power to influence you dream more directly, you can explore it more fully...

Your comment:

> I imagine if all of this wasn't real there would be some sort of being who is at a higher level. I'd basically just be saying "no" to them while hoping I persist through whatever long enough to meet them and ask "what the fuck were you thinking?"

Reminds me of this:

> [Actually, there's only one instant, and it's right now, and it's eternity. And it's an instant in which God is posing a question, and that question is basically, 'Do you want to, you know, be one with eternity? Do you want to be in heaven?' And we're all saying, 'No thank you. Not just yet.'
>
> And so time is actually just this constant saying 'No' to God's invitation. I mean that's what time is. I mean, and it's no more 50 A.D. than it's two thousand and one. And there's just this one instant, and that's what we're always in."
>
> And then she [the woman I was talking to] tells me that actually this is the narrative of everyone's life. That, you know, behind the phenomenal difference, there is but one story, and that's the story of moving from the "no" to the "yes." All of life is like, "No thank you. No thank you. No thank you." then ultimately it's, "Yes, I give in. Yes, I accept. Yes, I embrace." I mean, that's the journey. I mean, everyone gets to the "yes" in the end, right?]
>
> *-- Ch. 18. Trapped in a Dream, Waking Life Movie Transcript*

Just refreshed and saw the later replies.

> > If the experience of life is an illusion then no one is truly experiencing anything. It may feel real, but it is not real in this case.

Isn't the problem here what you mean by "real"? It's all "real". Not truly experiencing anything? Everyone is experiencing themselves, but not as a "person". Is the universe only valid if it was created by something external to us? Is there only a "point" to life in that case?

> > Seems a bit arrogant to go around telling people they are wrong about subjects such as this. Perhaps "I do not agree" would be better. Or do you have proof that you are right that can be verified?

Hmm. I wasn't saying you were wrong 'in real life'. The reply was in the context of the OP saying "this is a dream" and if that was the case, then our theory that there was a solid world behind it would be wrong, and you saying that "in that case, I'd just sit about". I wasn't meaning that *you* were wrong.

> Again, please remember this was all originally about a hypothetical situation. You're talking to me like I actually believe these things and it's confusing.

Sorry, that's just for convenience - by being in the comments, I'm assuming we're "taking the OP proposal as the starting point" and so don't need to keep caveating. Assume "in this scenario" throughout.

> > Curiosity is the only thing that keeps me going. I feel a need to know how it all works.

That's the tricky bit. If it is a dream-like reality, then any explanation we encounter, any evidence that it was a "solid world made of matter" would also itself just be a dream experience. There is no way out of that. There turns out to be no "how it works", just "how it *appears* to work when we look at it today".

So instead of *curiosity* being the driver (it has been for me in the past), it would have to be *creativity* that became the driver?

I think the idea of a "top level" implies a structured hierarchy, and I don't really believe in that - it seems to follow from the notion that we wake up from dreams, that dreams are somehow like a smaller Russian Doll contained within the Russian Doll of waking life. The experience itself isn't like that though, surely?

I don't wake up "into reality". What seems to happen is that the dream world dissolves, and then "this" world appears - in the same space. One doesn't seem to be inside the other, or higher than the other. I can be 'lucid' inside a dream without switching levels in some sense; can I not be 'lucid' inside this 'waking dream'?

When you die, it might not be "you" that switches perspective to a higher level. If might just be that "you" remain, and the world dissolves. And something else forms in its place.

> So, no, as it stands now you cannot be lucid within this "waking dream" if were in fact a dream. You can only delude yourself into believing you are.

Hmm. Thought-provoking. In a lucid dream, we might realise that we are "dreaming" because we recall "another world" that we were in before sleeping - lucid by memory. However, the *nature of our experience* can be different to what we assumed, and that is a different path to lucidity.

In fact, I'd suggest that when I get lucid in a dream, it's not that I remember a larger world, *rather that I recall the concept of dreaming and my experience fits that concept after that realisation*. And *this* is something we can do in waking life - realise that our experience doesn't correspond to the "solid, mechanistic" theory that we hold of it. We don't need to wake up *from* the dream, we can just wake up *to* the dream.

> For you to become truly lucid within this waking life it would first need to be proved a dream with science.

Which could never happen, because science is *within* the dream (following this idea along). However, I can notice that things aren't how they are meant to be. This can only be done by 1st person, personal experience though.

In a lucid dream, we awaken to the fact that we aren't just the dream character we seem to be, we are the entire context of the dream. To become lucid in waking life would to be realise something of the same thing: you are not a person, you are the background environment?

> advancements in mathematics and physics

The problem with simulations is that you can always just say that the simulation is such that it looks like *this*. It depends on whether we mean "simulation" as in 3d mechanism (content matters), or "simulation" as in, we are each presented with a VR-like experience (content is arbitrary) - like Donald Hoffman's idea of a multimodal user interface. The first is just a different version of materialism - it just means the container is different - the latter is a version of the dream/video-game idea.

Any *content-based* proof of a dream while within a dream is made of "dream" - even an apparent memory of there being an encompassing 'waking world' - until we actually wake up *from* it. So proof would have to be *non* content-based to wake up *to* it.

So I'm thinking the 3d lattice idea, for instance, isn't really a restriction that tests for the condition.

> I agree that any one of us can only wake up to the dream. And, yes, this would mean knowing, with proof, that we are collectively the sum of all of all our existence. The same concept would apply even if you were to call it a simulation.

Yes, it doesn't matter what we call it, it all just means "we are not living in and as an atoms-and-structure mechanistic world after all".

So, meditation and altered state and non-dual experiences, can they point to this? Because I can conceive of no *3rd person* 'objective' evidence that can prove it, because that's just more "experiences" and can't really point to the *nature* of the experiences?

> Any content-based proof of a dream while within the dream still proves that it is a dream. So I fail to see an issue with it being made of that dream.

Actually, "proof" is the wrong word, strictly speaking. My error. If a dream is truly a super-flexible space that contain any experience, then I was getting at that it would be impossible to prove with 3rd-person observation. All that can be proved is that other descriptions are incorrect in their correspondence to experience...

> When you mention the memory you're talking about the dream as if it itself is the sentient being.

Memory doesn't necessarily mean this. A tray of jello has a "memory", in that if you pour warm water over it, it will "remember" the path of the water and subsequent pouring will tend to flow along previous paths. However, it the jello was "consciousness" it could be said to *experience* the pathways, the flow.

Note: not necessarily *self consciousness*, as in an ability to reflect on itself. Only the ability to experience what was within it. Of course, it might label one of those jello-impressions with the word "me" - and then get confused, thinking it was that particular jello-impression, rather than the whole jello tray.

> It is a projection of a sentient being. The memory exists within you. You are the source of the dream. The dream isn't the source of you. There is no need to wake up from it to realize this.

Right, *but*. It depends on the "you". The character/person you seem to be in the dream - the thoughts, body sensations - that "you" is generated by the dream. The dream *is* the source of the "you" that you *seem* to be in the dream. The larger "you" is the whole of the dream, it turns out once you've woken up. You could realise this during the dream, *if you could find some evidence that the "small you" was not in fact the real you, and that you were in fact the whole environment and the source of that environment*.

Leading us to...

> I do not think meditation, or altered states, can bring anyone any closer to the nature of experiences than walking down the street. To understand the nature of experience we would need to first fully understand and be able to replicate consciousness. To say that anyone is truly experiencing anything right now is delusion. It is putting faith in unverifiable experience.

I disagree.

I'd say the way to understand the nature of experience is to *fully investigate your personal experience directly*.

When in a night-time dream, the way (one way) to realise you are dreaming and become lucid is to note a difference between the dream and wake-time experience. However, the dream content can still be completely identical to waking life experience. How would you tell the difference if you couldn't remember a "waking level"? In most dream, in fact, we don't.

Examining dream character's brains and looking through electron microscopes in a dream wouldn't tell you that you were dreaming. Scientists have dreams like that all the time, and don't - in the dream - realise they are dreaming.

Perhaps waking life is one such dream?

If there is such a hypothetical approach - to identify we are dreaming when we don't remember a larger "waking life", or let's say "alternative world-experience to get rid of the layers metaphor - we could then apply that to this "waking level" to test, from a personal perspective, whether this daily life was dream-like in the same way.

Again, the *content* of the dream is unreliable, it can only tell us that our in-dream theories are wrong as they apply to dream content. Examination of the content cannot tell us whether we are in a dream or not.

> When I say "you" I don't mean who you see yourself as in everyday waking life. I mean whatever makes you fundamentally you, separate from everyone else.

Yeah, that's what the quotes are for, to emphasise that it's a constructed idea, a particular meaning rather than the general meaning, drawing attention to it.

> A tray of jello does not have memories.

Jello has about as much memory as neurons, in the example. Y'know, it's a metaphor.

> When I say "you" I don't mean who you see yourself as in everyday waking life. I mean whatever makes you fundamentally you, separate from everyone else. The dream does not create this. The dream can never create this.

And, what is it that makes you fundamentally you? If you don't know what that is, you can't comment on whether a dream can create it or not. If this *is* a dream, then it can obviously create everything you are experiencing.

> Which scientist with electron microscopes have you been talking to? Working to figure out physics in a dream would be immensely harder due to the constantly changing environment.

I think we can agree that sleeping dreams are more flexible than waking life. It's not true that they can't be stable though: non-lucid dreams are usually more stable than lucid ones, and the variable nature of lucid dreams is down to the flaky expectations of the dreams; it's easy to have stable lucid dreams if you mentally commit to it. And I'm pretty committed to waking life.

> Are you saying if we discovered a philosophical zombie you would not begin to suspect that this is a dream?

You wouldn't know it was a philosophic zombie; you'd just think the person was a bit "strange". We meet people like that all the time. Perhaps they *are* p-zombies.

> Examination of the content could tell us it's a dream if we collectively do in fact have a waking life we cannot remember now. It would just be a matter of locating the right information. So looking at the content for this purpose is not entirely useless.

What would the right information be? See, I'm still not seeing how you plan to establish that this is or isn't a dream. We've put aside the ability to remember another waking life that's "higher up". So it's down to the content. Stability doesn't cut it, because some dreams are more stable than others; some are rock-solid. Any content we encounter in the dream is made of dream-stuff, it's self-referencing and so can't tell us about the nature of the background to the experience.

Reply to “In your opinion, what entails being "awake", and conversely, being "asleep"?”

> > Awakening is realising that you're not the protagonist character in the movie, you're the awareness in the cinema watching the entire drama unfold.

Or ***you are the screen*** **on which the movie image is playing out.** To say you're *watching* means you are separate. In fact you are both the experiencer and the material from which the experience is made.

This leads me to say:

- Being "asleep" means you've narrowed your attention onto the patterns of experience and are arbitrarily identifying with some of them (e.g. thoughts and body sensations, the concept or feeling thought of "me") and not others (e.g sights and sounds at a distance from body sensations).
- Being "awake" means your attention has opened out to include the context, the background space in which those patterns arise - identifying with that, with "consciousness", and realising that all patterns arise within that. In other words, "it's all you, the real you".

This is awake/asleep in the sense of direct perception, in the sense of understanding "what you really are". There's obviously political, character, and social-based awakenings that one can have too.

Depression, I'd suggest, can be a contraction of attention onto a particular pattern perhaps without knowing it - perhaps as a result of controlling and not releasing - leading to a "stuck thought" or "incomplete movement". For this, I like your analogy of getting tired of holding onto the controller. In truth, you shouldn't be holding onto the controller at all. You should be "directing from afar" by indirect request and with patience, rather than grabbing onto and forcibly pushing parts of your reality around.

[...]

> > [Q: Recently watched "Waking Life" by Richard Link later. One character made the interesting point that there is no difference between being awake and being asleep other than the amount which we are allowed to perceive. While awake natural biological processes filter out certain inputs to prevent our experience from being chaotic in nature. While dreaming anything is possible but the effects of what you experience end when you wake up. If you were to use the full range of your senses in waking you might (reasonably) go insane and do harm to yourself or others.]

Or: **You are always merely dreaming**. It's just that during waking life, your dream environment is "inspired by" and stabilised by sensory inputs - but quite minimally. (For instance, the actual input from your eyes is nothing compared with your perception of this room right now. This is a mind-environment.)

Yes, the dream-state is primary, it's just the content that changes. The idea of it being inspired by something "external" (like a room, light and eyes) is just an idea really! Your body is part of the dream environment, it's never really "your body". It's all just part of the fun, temporary experience. :-)

It's interesting that this waking-life dream seems to be our "hub" that we return to again and again.

How would we practice?

Reply to “What is truth?”

Two sorts of truth:

- ***Conceptual Truth:*** Systems of thought that are coherent, self-consistent. These "feel true" simply because their parts are true relative to the other parts. Conceptual truth may or may not correspond to reality - i.e. direct perception.
- ***Direct Truth:*** The truth of direct experience. I touch a table and discover that its surface is hard. That is directly true; it is my experience right now.

The complication: Adopting a conceptual framework actually deforms your direct experience according to its patterns. We can experience our conceptual truths (beliefs) as being directly true (as filtered). Fortunately, this "overlay" can be identified, dissolved or seen through.

> Is there algorithm to the processes we use to identify Direct Truth as a species?

Well, as a personal endeavour one can shift away from *thinking-about* to *direct-sensing*. A movement from thinking to knowing. However, this cannot be communicated. The universe we experience is within ourselves. Language involves dividing that experience into "parts" and "narrative". Immediately, in the effort to communicate, we have destroyed the essence of the experience. All that can be done is to *point* to where that experience is to be found. It cannot be spoken, or conceptualised.

We can transfer conceptual frameworks between one another, and thereby infect others with the same "overlay" or "template" which we are using, but we cannot give someone the truly direct truth by this method. Obviously, if we throw away enough and only focus on the simplest, regular aspects of experience using the simplest concepts, we can get somewhere. For instance, if we say the world is made of up lines and corners and throw away almost everything else, then we can develop shared knowledge and even deterministic predictions of what lines and corners will do in the future. That's universal language - eventually - but it doesn't seem like something worth shooting for other than for making, y'know, tables and chairs and stuff. (Nothing wrong with tables and chairs, or electron microscopes, but their creation isn't showing us "how things really, really work".)

> truth: being in accord with fact or reality

The problem is, the facts change with the being.

... It does - except "the truth": **The background awareness that you are**, because that is not an object or a structure and so it cannot change. It doesn't "exist" and so it is permanent. This is the direct truth that is always accessible, always here, because it is that from which everything else arises and fades.

Reply to “Have any of you traveled to parallel universe? How? Got any tips for me?”

> [Q: r/DimensionalJumping/
>
> bunch of hokey if you ask me]

Aw, you're no fun... ever tried it?

> [Q: It seems obvious to me that the thoughts I think and the actions I execute are all the traveling to parallel universes that I need. I can see how dimensional jumping would work: you are looking into a mirror and with utmost focus you will something. Of course this changes your life! You are willing something sincerely! But to think you need to look into a mirror and that you are actually "dimension jumping" or that you don't need an actual change in your life style is silly. But hey what do I know.]

To an extent you're right.

The mirror technique is a bit of a traditional hangover from scrying and whatever - a way to loosen your focus, detach, and reformat your mind (hence your experience). And "dimensions" are metaphorical in this context. Just a way to conceptualise a sudden shift. In fact, dimensions are conceptual anyway: if you examine your actual experience, you don't find any dimensions. However, it provides a way of formulating intention. The interesting bit is that, if you play with it, it's a bit more than goal-setting and pattern-matching. The very flexible "active metaphors" being used do allow for pretty sudden shifts - extreme synchronicity, definitely, glitch-like experiences, certainly.

Like all these things, you need to experiment a little personally to really understand (or dismiss) it. There *is* an effect - the mechanism behind the effect, if there is a mechanism, is something to ponder though.

Reply to “What are some of your "out there", unconventional thoughts about this reality and your own consciousness?”

> Q: This life is a dream and each of us is a small fraction of the dreamer. **Anything is possible. Nothing is forbidden**. But what we do to each other, we do to ourselves.

I like this efficient way of saying it. Do you see yourself as the *dreamer*?

> Q (duck_amuck): Hahaha my ego wishes! No, I think we are literally one God-soul, lost within itself.

Yeah, "Phwahaha, you are all my obedient puppets now!" :-)

Doesn't that mean you are the dream character *and* the dreamer *and* the dream environment? Meaning "duck_amuck" is a character who borrows his power from the dream, as it were, but he's still the dream and the dreamer too - just as /u/duck_amuck borrows his power from Reddit.

Actually, I quite like that idea, and it fits experience a bit: Characters borrow their power, so they can only "submit requests" for what they want to do to the larger dream, hoping that the dream will then move them as requested. All the while, of course, they are actually the larger dream all along, *pretending* they have to ask...? *

Here's a picture of duck_amuck hanging out with a chickeny pal, pretending to be separate.

Better: They are the larger dream, having *confused themselves* into thinking they are the character.

> Lol to the pic. But yeah, something like that... Ego is the character. Self is the dreamer. Self has unlimited power, but the character is the one driving the story within its limited scope/means/belief systems.

Self-ego-character, sounds about right. "Big Self, Little Self". Would make a good title for a children's esoteric television show. Another way is to rebrand this. Self is the universe. Ego is just a bit of that universe. What we call "you" is just the sphere of attention, perimeter of experience we are currently maintaining.

We think that we are "ego" when we localise on the region of body-space where selfish thoughts seem to arise (typically, towards the rear of the head); we think we are the universe when we dissolve the perimeter; in-between and we think we make "connections" and have non-local paranormal powers.

There are lots of 'cult-type' efforts and 'self-help' arrangements, but there's nothing legitimate. In school, we don't even teach the history of religions and beliefs/worldviews anymore (as opposed to the content).

I am very interested in seeing insights brought into modern, accessible language, together with investigative approaches ('exercises' without any nonsense) a person can use to discover themselves and the world.

People like Rupert Spira attempt this to some extent, but somehow it doesn't cover the whole subject (life!) for me.

[...]

Hmm, you raise interesting questions, indirectly.

> Just as an apple appears inert, when it's actually a constant teeming mass of energies and chemical transformations and organic life cycles, all creating the end result of a perceivably delicious apple.

Is it *externally* so? Or are you just imagining these things, *thinking about* them?

> My body and the way I behave towards the world is the emergent result of the interactions of my inner components, from spleen to soul.

Is that your actual experience? Or is it a story that has emerged or been adopted which shapes your thinking *about* the world? Surely, if you close your eyes and listen to a sound in the distance, you are both "here" where your body is and simultaneously "there" beside the sound? If you "feel out" and try to detect a boundary between "in here" and "out there", do you find one?

> Personally, I see the inside of my head as being its own n-dimensional space and happily use it as such, with my mind as the translation point between it and the outside.

Don't you find that, actually, the room around you is inside that n-dimensional space too? Where is this "mind" you speak of - isn't it actually the n-dimensional space, in which all your experiences (thoughts *and* senses) appear?

> If I can't break down the barrier,

You never can break down the barrier, because there isn't one, and you never really experience one. You are just *thinking* that there is a barrier.

Maybe. :-)

> You're never gonna find a single answer to any of those questions, because the answer is everything and nothing.

See, your original post suggested the opposite position.

> I choose to enjoy the world and being in it, regardless of its ultimate dimensional structure. Empty words won't change that.

I don't think anyone's challenging your enjoyment, just that "inner vs outer distinction is still completely insurmountable within the 3D physical universe".

Although re-reading my comment, it sounds *way* more challenging and antagonistic than it did in my head as I wrote it. I was just pointing out that I don't think there really is an inner/outer distinction. Not that it's an "illusion" (whatever that really means), to be dismissed, just that it's possible to delete it as an experience.

> The universe is as it is. Why not simply appreciate it for what it is without expecting it to conform to words?

People are always going to want to describe the world or their experience in some way, right? It can never conform to words, because words are *in* the world. But who's aiming for that? It's about pointing to the gaps. And it's not as straightforward to appreciate it for what it is, when what it "is" isn't at all clear, and seems to change depending on how you look at it. (Personally I mean; I'm not invoking pseudo-QM nonsense here.)

That's the equivalent of telling someone to "just be themselves".

> In what way do you believe it's possible to allow others to see the processes that go on inside you?

There aren't any others.

. . .

But of course I mean that in a particular way. I don't experience others as separate people, but as images and sounds and feelings in my aware space (call it whatever you want). If I hold my hand up in front of me, do I see it as separate or as part of me? I can *feel* my hand, so I assume its me. But that's pretty arbitrary, treating the feeling-sensation as somehow special. If the feeling of my hand went away, it would just be another image floating in front of me. It would seem no more than me as the chair over there. In fact, I can see my hand from the perspective of my head. But I can't see my head from the perspective of my hand. Similarly, I can see you (say) from the perspective of my head, but I can't see my head from the perspective of your head. The apparent separation is only in the thinking, only according to quite arbitrary rules, and arbitrary challenges.

Being the same thing, of the same thing, doesn't mean literally experiencing every sensation everywhere. You don't even have that for you own body. Nor do you experience all your memories all the time.

> I guess my point here is... you cannot enjoy something while picking it apart to see how it works.

All good points. *Division* removes the wholeness, and wholeness is the living, the connected movement. Not even in some esoteric way. Just in an everyday way.

> Endlessly asking questions of the universe it cannot answer are, ultimately, a distraction from the experience of the universe, wherever that experience comes from. Linear words automatically...

Which is why you don't question with words, you "question" with direct attention, you *attend* to your direct experience as it is. *Thinking-about* always removes you from yourself and the world. It's a disappearing into a fantasy sphere, while imagining (literally) that you are exploring the innards of the real world.

Whenever we *think-about* we are looking away from the *thing-in-itself*.

> Obviously, this is unavoidable on a practical scale seeing as we lack telepathy.

We *do* have a sort of telepathy in the *felt-sense*, that direct global knowing we have. Just because it isn't unpacked into sentences and concepts. (But of course I know what you mean.)

> But philosophically speaking, I've found that to enjoy the world as it is mostly just requires one stop questioning why it is.

To summarise: you can't *be* something and *think-about* it at the same time?

/r/Outside/

Reply to “Why did the devs implement dreams?”

> OP: My question is, why implement this feature if it doesn't really provide a benefit or penalty because everything I do in one of these "dream" levels has no effect on my character?

These aren't features, they are the mechanics of how *Outside* operates!

You are not actually the character you play in *Outside*, rather you are an open "game-space" which connects to *Outside* and adopts a particular perspective in the *Outside* game environment. In periods of reduced activity, your "game-space" disconnects and either connects to another pre-existing game-world, or constructs one on its own, seeded by random data fluctuations. You can see this happening in the case of hypnogogia and fragmentary imagery.

Generally these worlds are more flexible than *Outside*, because to save on processor and memory power, all games function on a co-creation, procedural expectation/recall-based engine - so the more players there are, the more stable a game world becomes.

Because *Outside* is the main, default subscription for all current players there (part of the terms and conditions), you always reconnect to *Outside* whenever other connections collapse.

You can prove this to yourself by trying to observe the disconnection/reconnection in progress, or illustrate it via a thought experiment:

- Sit comfortably. Now imagine turning off your senses one by one:
- Turn off vision. Are you still there?
- Turn off sound. Still there?
- Turn off bodily sensations, such as the feeling of the chair beneath you. Uh-huh?
- Turn off thoughts. Where/what are you now?
- Some people are left with a fuzzy sense of being "located". This is just a residual thought. Turn that off too.

You're still there, you realise; you are a wide-open "aware space" in which those other experiences appeared. *Outside* is the generator of those experiences, including the body and many of the spontaneous thoughts and actions. Only a subset of change: *intentional* change, is actually your influence. The rest is just part of the game experience.

There are rumours of players who have developed limited, dev-like "magickal" powers based on "intentional" procedures, but since these would also produce a revised game narrative to cover their tracks - 'narrative/experiential coherence' is enforced religiously by the game engine - this is hard to confirm.

When you eventually complete *Outside*, after the final montage sequence, the connection is terminated and the 'world' within you disappears - followed by your next adventure, should you choose to accept it!

> So what happens when the game builds a world withing my "dream world"?

It doesn't. You're actually connecting to *another* server group completely, which is running a different instance of the game engine that *Outside* runs on, perhaps one with no players except for you. Since the game engine works by reflecting your expectations/recall back at you, a "dream world" is then spontaneously built for you to experience. Since your default subscription is to *Outside*, though, when that dream world fails, you are generally reconnected to *Outside* with the "waking up" intro.

> holy shit! you really understand this. very well done.

Just seeing it how it is! ;-)

/r/deadchildren/

Ref. NG for "froms vs influence"?

Hello! I was just saving that as a link to add to the Neville Goddard post elsewhere (people are often concerned about "other people" and accidental side-effects, and this lecture nicely summarises the "select a scene" approach vs targeting people's actions).

Your question - It's easiest to interpret "assume" as in "take on the image of" - you are summon the feeling-state of being wealthy. You have a scene which you are using to imagine yourself to be rich (as per Neville's approach). Furthermore, as you go about your day, you persist in that feeling "of the wish fulfilled" - the feeling that goes along with that state. Remember that what is really underneath Neville's approach that the scene around you now is basically thought anyway, just a very bright one. If you imagine something on top of that, overwrite the scene three-dimensionally with all senses, you are shifting *this* state to *that* state. Simply doing so at all, fully, leads to a movement of state and a result. However, if whenever you see evidence that you are not what you want and you get caught up in that - hence Neville instructions to "persist in the state" of the with fulfilled.

Try it and see eh. To broaden this out a bit: devil's in the details a little. So, literally say to yourself right now: *"One million dollars"*

What happens?

Yeah, my next thing to say was, it matters what the intention is behind the words/act:

- If you say the words "nice house" with the intention that doing so *means-that* you will have a vivid mental picture of a house, that's what will happen.
- If you say the words with the intention that it *means-that* you are going to be living in that house, similarly.

Which is why you can use everyday objects to make unconnected changes remotely. There's extra stuff about circumventing "plausibility" and time and all that, but it's not really important. Not having an intention is where people go wrong; like people who go to the gym but don't actually intend that going there *means-that* they will get fit.

Looking forward to the house party!

Will we ever understand the beginning of the universe? — Ross Andersen — Aeon Essays

Excerpt:

> ‘The last 30 years is a very unusual period in the history of fundamental physics and cosmology,’ Steinhardt told me. ‘There’s confusion, and maybe even a certain amount of fear. People are wedded to these ideas, because they grew up with them. Scientists don’t like to change ideas unless they’re forced to. They get involved with a theory. They get emotionally attached to it. When an idea is looking shaky, they go into defensive mode. If you’re working on something besides inflation, you find yourself outside the social network, and you don’t get many citations. Only a few brave souls are willing to risk that.’
>
> I teased Steinhardt, pointing out that he hadn’t exactly been hauled before the Inquisition. Steinhardt is fully tenured, a lion of Princeton’s storied physics department. He walks the same leafy streets that Albert Einstein walked. Indeed, his official title at Princeton is Albert Einstein Professor in Science. Still, he feels overmatched. He told me he has asked for help from outside the field.
>
> ‘The outside community isn’t recognising the problem,’ he said. ‘This whole BICEP2 thing has made some people more aware of it. It’s been nice to have that aired out. But most people give us too much respect. They think we know what we’re doing. They take too seriously these voices that say inflation is established theory.’
>
> I asked him who might help. What cavalry was he calling for?
>
> ‘I wish the philosophers would get involved,’ he said.
>
> -- *Will we ever understand the beginning of the universe?*, Ross Anderson, Aeon Esays

QBism, the Perimeter of Quantum Bayesianism - Fuchs

FIG. 5. **Sarcasm**. In a lecture bottlenecked by repeated accusations of Quantum Bayesianism's solipsism, the author sometimes uses the following technique to move things along. Referring to the previous Figure 1, he asks the stubborn accuser, "What about this diagram do you *not* get? It shows an agent and a physical system external to him. It says that a quantum state is a *state of belief* about what will come about as a consequence of his actions upon the system. The quantum state is not a state of nature, but so what? There is an agent with his belief; there is a system that is not part of him; and there is something that really, eventually comes about —it is called *the outcome*. No agent, no outcome for sure, but that's not solipsism: For, no system, no outcome either! A quantum measurement without an external system participating would be like the sound of one hand clapping, a Zen koan. If we were really expressing solipsism, wouldn't a diagram like the one above be more appropriate? A big eye- ball surveying nothing. Now there's really no external system and nothing to act upon. *That's* solipsism."

[The sense in which there is something "external", though, might be better described as something not being "selected into experience", rather than something actually external to the experiencer due to a boundary or relative location - TG]

> [[**mindseal**: "Solipsism" is a trigger word for a lot of people. Once they hear or think that something is solipsistic, their thinking shuts down. It's hard to deal with this in physics, because physics is by design a collaborative process, and very few people know how to reconcile collaboration and solipsism. Most people assume that collaboration necessitates a non-solipsistic worldview, so dealing with this in physics is hard.
>
> But dealing with it in private life is easy: just don't talk to people who are triggered by "solipsism."
>
> You know when someone tells you "If you really believe in solipsism, why are you talking to me?" You can just say, "Why would I ever want to cross my arms? Don't you know that the only reason to cross one's arms is to keep the left arm from falling off with your right, and to keep the right arm from falling off by hanging onto it with your left. If both arms are the same body, why cross them????" The absurdity of this position should be obvious.]]

/r/MandelaEffect/

Reply to “I have a theory about why these happen”

I think the same applies here as to quantum-physics-inspired multiple universes descriptions. From a previous comment which then goes into more depth: I'm with George Ellis on this, as regards quantum theory, string theory and multiverses and so on. Although it might be interesting and fun to consider philosophically, it is essentially meaningless scientifically. Having said that, the Mandela Effect is a philosophical or metaphysical issue, really, and not a scientific one, so this is not necessarily a problem for the subject as a whole; it just means we need to be mindful of what we focus upon.

So, while it is *fun* to consider these narratives (and they *are* narratives) about our experiences, they are not testable theories. In fact, anything "outside of" our experience is not testable, and your description is mostly that. We might recognise that there are patterns which are *consistent with* the idea that something is happening - that are "as if" it were true - but that's not the same thing.

Which is fine, of course, because scientific theories aren't about "what is really happening" anyway; they are *useful abstractions*. However, when a description as almost no "observational touch-points" at all (that is, the description has very few observable components relative to the complexity of its conceptual framework) then the sense in which it is a *useful model*, rather than an *enjoyable story*, is questionable.

I really don't agree that "actual scientists" are proposing that we are living in a simulation, although they might engage in such "gee-whiz" discussions for popular-science-type magazines and programmes, as part of their promotional activities. (Nick Bostrom is not a good example.) If anything, one's treatment of such a hypothesis is a good indicator as to what extent you *are* an "actual scientist"!

> [OP: I like your comment, until the part where you claim you don't agree with the unarguable reality that scientists are actually working with this theory seriously and calculatedly. I mean, that's cool i guess, but it's the reality whether you believe it or not. And why the random disclaimer about how Bostrum doesn't count? Confusing.]

Bah, I knew I should have expanded on that bit of wordplay! Apologies.

So, that was intended to be a shorthand for a few things implied by the comment and the linked comment. For example, that one shouldn't conflate "working in a scientific role" with "this being a scientific hypothesis". The phrasing of "actual cosmologists and other scientists" heavily implies that the simulation hypothesis is itself a scientific hypothesis. As per the George Ellis article (to take one view), in what sense is someone being an "actual scientist" if they are engaging in what amounts to observationally-untethered philosophical musings?

Meanwhile, when I suggested that Nick Bostrom was "not a good example" in this context, it's because his *Are You Living in a Computer Simulation?* paper (hosted on his *The Simulation Argument* webpage) is sort of, intentionally or not, the logic equivalent of a wordplay joke. The amount of coverage it has got in the media as a "scientific" idea is largely to do with the ease with which it can be fashioned into a fun, engaging, pop-culture story in mainstream publications.

Moving past all that, though, I suggest the important question to ask would be: "what is the relationship between one's ongoing experience and any particular description of that experience?" and how the "simulation hypothesis" fits into whatever the answer is.

I think all of these "simulation" ideas can ultimately be reduced to the idea - the long-established and foundational idea - that descriptions don't explain "what is happening", rather they are codifications of regularities in observations (which are themselves an abstracted subset of experiences), by us. The end-point of the simulation hypothesis is, then, really just a rediscovery of the fact that the standard description is just that: a description, a useful abstraction, and isn't intended to be more than that (as per the N David Mermin article in the linked comment).

The "laws" of physics aren't like legal laws which the universe must "obey"; they are "observed regularities" we have woven into a conceptual framework. Any ideas about "breaking out of The Matrix", a la Musk, are a slightly mangled version of "recognising that your experience does not in fact arise within a conceptual framework", and then trying to do some things which are not "allowed". But they were never "forbidden" in the first place. The "simulation" stuff itself is just distracting fluff on top of this.

Reply to “Scientists believe Parallel Universes ARE interacting. Is this the cause of the 'Mandela Effect'?”

> [Q: This is a much contested debate right now in theoretical physics...
>
> > Argument 1: If a theory is sufficiently elegant and explanatory, it need not be tested experimentally. This is used by string theorist and cosmologists since their theories basically rely on extra dimensions that we can never observe.
> >
> > Argument 2: Scientific knowledge is empirical. It must be tested through observations of the real world to have value. Many scientist like George Ellis believe this.
> >
> > That's the problem with theories like multi-verses and quantum dimension... you either have to test using argument 1, or you have to claim it's simply a mental exercise because you cannot observe these things as solid objects. I tend to believe that unless we can question the "what if" statements, we have a very hard time advancing. Some of our greatest scientific leaps were made by saying "what if" when all the scientist around us said that the thing we were trying to prove, didn't exist. (things like microscopic germs, or quarks, or dark matter...)]

I agree with your comment about "what if" contemplation. As per Paul Feyerabend, I tend to think physics (for example) proceeds by a somewhat "anything goes" process in reality, with post-hoc justifications afterwards to clean up the story. And that is just fine. However, this makes it doubly important to adopt a "meta" perspective on the activity itself. Specifically, as I said above, the nature of descriptions themselves. I think the idea that our connecting concepts are "true" is somewhat recent, and has become prominent as philosophy has receded as a component in our scientific outlooks. (Even though the view that our descriptions are true is *itself* a hidden philosophical position.)

This is ultimately what George Ellis is pointing out in his essay, and why Stephen Hawking makes seemingly foolish grandiose statements occasionally, and why N David Mermin makes his comment about the "reification of abstraction". Not long ago, this wouldn't have need to be stated! The idea that the world was *really* made from "atoms" (rather that "the world", a concept, being constructed from "atoms", another concept); or that light *really was* a wave or a particle (two concepts) and that it having aspects of both ideas was a problem; or that "gravity" (loosely speaking, the name of a description) is what really causes things to fall down, would have seemed ridiculous. But that is how we talk, mostly, and it's at the root of a lot of the threads we see here and in more "scientific" publications: this weird muddle of the idea of what is "true" or "real" because there is no firm platform upon which the discussion is occurring.

Ideas, then, I'd suggest, are about being "effective": are they useful as a thinking tool, or as a predictive tool. Either is fine. Arguments (1) and (2) are both permitted, provided descriptions are viewed in this light, put in their proper context relative to our direct experience. That is, a blend of (1) a conceptual framework which acts as a useful template of relationships in order to facilitate thinking and (2) an abstraction and codification of repeatable observations, with a greater or lesser number of "observational touch-points" for direct experience, but still never getting "behind" direct experience.

/r/Paranormal/

Reply to “Beside personal anecdotes, what evidence for anything paranormal exists for which you adamantly believe in?”

> [Q1: No - we *believed* Higgs Boson must be real because it was implied by the evidence we had. There was a point where we *believed* luminiferous aether must exist because it made sense of our understanding of things at that time, but experiments eventually debunked that one, so they had to rethink. *That* is how science works. What you have there is a belief system with science as the object of your faith - which is fine, but it's not the granite foundation you imagine it to be.]
>
> [Q2: Exactly! That is how science works and it is much more streamlined today then what it was back in the 'ether believing days'. Back then, it took a long time to collaborate or test other people's hypothesis. Now, we can communicate on a much faster level. Hell, scientists can work on the same projects while being half way around the world. That was unheard of back then. You are right, we do sometimes get things wrong, but we at least know the probability of getting it wrong or right.]

> > we at least know the probability of getting it wrong or right.

Really? How do we calculate this probability?

It's important to realise about science is that it doesn't tell you how things actually *are* - it does not reveal *truth*. Rather, it is a process by which we make observations, identify situations which appear with regularity, and then invent concepts and stories to connect them together for the purposes of description and prediction. For instance, there is no such thing as "gravity" other than as a concept - in fact, the concept called "gravity" has changed quite a lot over the years. However, it has been an extremely useful connective idea. In science, observations are primary and theories/models are secondary:

- Observations limit the possible models.
- Models do not limit the possible observations.

The whole "paranormal" thing is difficult, because by their nature the phenomena reported aren't repeatable, either on demand or under a controlled conditions. So we shouldn't dismiss it as "not existing". We must simply say: "science has nothing to say about it at the moment". Otherwise we end up dismissing things like ball lightning:

> **Until the 1960s, most scientists argued that ball lightning was not a real phenomenon but an urban myth, despite numerous reports throughout the world.**
>
> Laboratory experiments can produce effects that are visually similar to reports of ball lightning, but whether these are related to the natural phenomenon remains unclear.
>
> Many scientific hypotheses about ball lightning have been proposed over the centuries. Scientific data on natural ball lightning are scarce, owing to its infrequency and unpredictability. The presumption of its existence is based on reported public sightings, and has therefore produced

> somewhat inconsistent findings. Given inconsistencies and lack of reliable data, the true nature of ball lightning is still unknown.

The tendency of modern scientists (or actually: popular science reporting) to imply that if our theories don't accommodate something then it is not "real" is a foolish misunderstanding of the method - and something that the great men and women of science last century would have laughed at.

> > Gravity isn't real but only as a concept? Then how the hell do we send space probes out 3 billion miles to hit a target that is 65 meters by 75 meters?

"Gravity" is a concept we invented to connect certain observations. That concept allows us to make predictions, including those relating to the launching of projectiles. It is a real... ly useful conceptual framework. Come back to *what we actually observe* - objects in motion. We never see gravity, and gravity itself as a concept has been changed many times. What *is* real is the observation that "objects move in relation to one another even in the absence of contact". The rest is a story to link those observations.

If you don't understand that, then you don't understand science and the nature of theories at all. It will lead you to think theories are "how things really truly are in reality" and you'll end up being defensive and arrogant and warrior-like about the theories of today, even as others are trying to replace them with the fresh observations and theories of tomorrow. Of course, this is old news: science often only moves on when proponents of the old theories die. (I'm not implying anything by that, I hasten to add.)

It's amusing to note how the groundbreaking scientists of the early-to-mid 20th century were all philosophers as much physical theorists (e.g. Bohr as mentioned in the article), but in today's *science-as-engineering-certainty* view the philsophical ideas are often dismissed as "mystical meanderings" of the wayward minds of retirees (e.g. Schrodinger's *What is Life?* lectures; Pauli's collaborations; Bohm's ideas). Actually, those meanderings were the basis for the physics, and there was always caution separating the "thing-in-itself" from the description.

I guess that's a problem with how these things get taught in school and university: "here is how it works" is the approach, and students start to confuse ideas with existence. Paul Feyerabend should be mandatory on the syllabus! :-)

[...]

> [Q3: Not so much paranormal, but I do find the fact that in order for the big bang to have had occurred as it did, things had to have an unreasonable (to our understanding) level of organization. It should have collapsed back into itself, not expanded. It's too complex for me to explain adequately, but entropy was freakishly low, and there seems to be an arrow of time. In short, the big bang (if true) was a highly ordered event.]
>
> [Q4: This is assuming the big bang actually happened. What if it didn't? Maybe the universe has always existed?]
>
> [Q5: It can't though. There has to be a start somewhere. Stars don't form out of the blue. We need stars to have planets and the other elements that we see.]

Well, nothing *has* to start somewhere - that's a limit of our imagination, surely? In the same way we find it hard to imagine that something doesn't have boundaries, that there might be no "outside". Sometimes, we

might be asking the wrong question. After all, what physics actually is, is a "bunch of cool ideas that some people have had". We've already been round the loop a few times, I'm sure there will be more ideas to come which flatten the previous ones. Change is fun:

> The universe may have existed forever, according to a new model that applies quantum correction terms to complement Einstein's theory of general relativity. The model may also account for dark matter and dark energy, resolving multiple problems at once.
>
> -- *No Big Bang? Quantum equation predicts universe has no beginning*, Phys.org

EDIT: Oops, sorry, I see this has already been brought up. I will add that, yes, "they are discussing it but that does not mean it is a fact". However, that is precisely true of the big bang, dark matter, and all that, as they stand. They are connective ideas not observed facts. All of them are invoked mainly to make the math work (see George Ellis' *Nature* commentary for a good moan about that).

Disclaimer: I am an admirer of David Bohm's work generally.

> > Physics is the mathematical law that describes our universe. It's way more than just a bunch of cool ideas.

What I was getting at is, physics is a collection of concepts and frameworks that *we have invented*, inspired by observations.

> > No it's not because the Big Bang is described using physics. It's not an idea, guess or anything like that.

Of course it is. "Described using physics" just means we are using a certain language and set of concepts. A 'theory' is a description which fits observations and/or other theories. If that's not an "idea", what is? There are plenty of theories which offer another interpretation to things like the big bang (one of them being based on Bohmian mechanics). Things fall in and out of favour.

Another take: do you think that the multiple solutions in the equations of quantum mechanics indicate that Many Worlds are literally "real"? Or do you believe that the delayed choice experiment indicates that a participatory universe dictated by the observer is "real"?

> [[“we are participants in bringing into being not only the near and here, but the far away and long ago.”
>
> -- John Wheeler]]

Only the observations are real(ish). I did study physics...

/r/Philosophy/

Reply to “What if our reality were a computer simulation: Edeline D'Souza”

> >In her second point, she suggests that life is like a video game where objects don't exist outside of what's on a screen. But, isn't this like asking the famous question "If a tree falls in the woods and nobody hears it, did it make any noise?" Yeah, it made noise.

It didn't make "noise", though - at best it resulted in a vibration, or some other form of change in the underlying state of the world. Similarly, what occurs off-screen in a video game doesn't make a "sound" or "vision". It exists in *some* way, but not in a way that corresponds to our experience of it if it's within our sphere of attention.

> >And we're getting close to a Berkeley-like model of the universe where things only exist if we apprehend them.

Well, isn't it better to say that they don't exist in the same way that we *experience* them. Just like the windows-based user interface on our computer screens don't correspond to actual windows and little pictures *inside* the computer; the internal reality of the files and folders is different to how we experience them.

This isn't to suggest that we're living in a simulation, so much as things "exist" or are enfolded into the world in a way that differs from our easy-to-navigate unfolded experience of them. We experience a GUI optimised for human functioning, or that corresponds to the format of our human "screens".

> >The levels of those properties didn't make the matter, that matter simply is and it has properties.

The "matter" - by which I mean the enfolded reality that our experience is a filtering or objectification of - has no properties. Properties are aspects we experience, a part of the "conceptual overlay" that our world "snaps to", resulting in a "mind dream of objects and narrative".

Just like the objects and narrative of life aren't made of "pixels" and "frames", however it appears to be so-constructed when depicted on a TV screen. The world isn't made of "things and stories" *out there in the raw*; those are the structures of our minds not of the underlying reality.

This solves the "matter requires an observer" problem because instead of the rest of the world being arranged spatially, "out there", it is actually present enfolded, "in here". In other words, the whole universe is enfolded into the space of the room you are (apparently) in right now. To observe any part of the universe is to observe it all.

> >Sure the universe is mathematical, like a computer, but everything exists of the basis of mathematics

Not sure about this. Is it really? In what way? Mathematics might be a useful abstract way of representing forms and relationships, but that's different to the universe *being* mathematical.

What it really means is you've lost the ability to identify "parts" and are left only with "relationships". In fact, physics has always been about abstracting away the "parts" (see: centres of gravity, points, etc), but finally we've got to the stage where we see we never deal with "parts" anyway.

It probably says more about the *approach* than the fundamental reality. Although your addition, "of which we are aware", is insightful: We are modelling what appears in our awareness, and there are no objects in awareness (if you really investigate it) but there are seeming relationships.

Reply to “Can we formulate panpsychism such that it doesn't sound completely ridiculous?”

I'm thinking: is the basic issue not just that of mixing up *consciousness*, *conscious-of* and *self-consciousness*?

Conscousness/of/self

An electron isn't *conscious* - rather it *is consciousness*. That's what it is made from, and everything else is too. All things therefore have *being-awareness*, the experience of being itself as itself. This is not the same as reflective consciousness.

From there, we have:

- ***Conscious-of**:* If there was patterned structure within the boundary of the electron, then the electron could be said to "experience" or be conscious *of* that structure. For a human, this means the sensations, perceptions, and thoughts which arise within themselves.
- ***Self-consciousness**:* This would be the ability for something to (incorrectly) identify with one part of the structure within its boundary and not another. This is what humans do: They identify with certain sensations, perceptions, thoughts (within themselves) and not others.

Within this, we would then go to more subtle structures, such as directed attention (often described as a "torch" but really better referred to as a "filter" perhaps).

The Blanket Metaphor

For this overall picture, I quite like the metaphor of a blanket of material whose only property is *awareness*. Laid out flat, the blanket would only experience *being-aware*. It wouldn't experience being aware *of* anything; it would just be "consciousness". It would have no perceivable boundary; it would have no characteristics at all. Until, that is, folds or ripples were made in the blanket. At this point, the blanket would be "conscious of" those patterns. Those folds and ripples would be its "world", as far as it was concerned.

Patterns would change and shift and over "time" (measured as one shift relative to another) the world would become different. However, perhaps one part of the pattern would remain reasonably consistent or change very slowly. As the only consistent thing in its world, the blanket might incorrectly identify that part of the pattern as "itself" - confusing its knowing of being unchangingly simply *being-aware* with the persistence of one of the experiences, the content of its *awareness*. This would be "self-consciousness".

Worlds, Ripples and Nonlocality

I'd say the bit that comes after this, though, is the *form* in which facts-of-the-world are then present. The notion of a literal extended-in-space world that is "external" to localised peaks of consciousness starts to seem dubious. The world as experienced may be better described as a *shaping* or *enfolded patterning* of consciousness within that area.

This would mean that the enfolded topology of a region of consciousness would be identical with its experience of the world (and basically would be the world, for that region). Furthermore, one's mode of thinking would deform the topology as much as sensory experiences would - one would to an extent literally experience one's beliefs.

Referring to the blanket metaphor: In a sense, the "blanket" is simultaneously everywhere, only the "patterns" are located. The "blanket" is non-spatial and non-temporal; the whole world is therefore within it at every point. (Obviously this is trickier to imagine, because the picture we have of a blanket *is* spatially extended - however, we can see that it is all "blanket" and that "blanket" is everywhere and nowhere.)

[...]

Working from direct experience onwards is definitely a key approach. Everything you experience *exists as experience*, and if you imagine turning off your senses, you find there is an open unstructured background to it. If you shift your perspective to this background (and it can be done, simply by deciding) then that sense of the world passing through you becomes prominent, and the nature of objects becomes clearer.

You have to be careful when pondering this to *stay 1st-person* and not drift into 3rd-person *thinking-about* mode. That way you realise when you are supposing "external things as the source of experience" and so on. It's important to realise that we never have an experience outside this perspective, no matter what clever conceptual frameworks we come up with.

> >Is it not reasonable to assume that a "mind" is simply what a brain "looks like" when its existence is not seen as a reflection caused by sensory input into some other mind?

Or rather, that a "brain" is what a mind looks like, as an image? If "awareness" is the fundamental property, and everything is patterns of that, then all reality has an experience of *being-aware*, of being itself. Sufficient complexity is what allows one part of a pattern to reflect upon itself, using patterns within itself.

Meaning chairs and brains are indeed the same, fundamentally. Complexity doesn't change the nature of things, but it does allow more degrees of freedom. Cristof Koch has in the past taken IIT and then adds to it that: "**consciousness is fundamental**". It still doesn't get there though, because it still has a duality to it that you can't find in direct experience.

[...]

You're about to see how difficult this stuff is to put into language, and that when you do attempt, it usually sounds mystical and slightly nonsensical... Perhaps a bit of dialogue can clarify it though! Thanks for engaging in the discussion. If nothing else, it means I'm forced to try to describe it more clearly (or not).

Steps Along the Way

> >It might be confusing if you're using it to explain to someone who doesn't quite get the idea of panpsychism yet.

It's so often the case that we have to describe things "incorrectly" for a while until we're along the path a bit, at which point the context has shifted and we can reformulate that description. The "brains and images" concepts definitely fall into that category. And "standard panpsychism" itself is really a step along the way. It still assumes a fundamentally n-dimensional spatial-temporal world. But we leave that once we've established the "matter" of the matter, when we start to see the implications of a "single nonmaterial material".

> >this open field in which experiences unfold themselves, if I understand you correctly, would in the context of panpsychism represent the entire universe?

Right. Although to say "universe" is even too much, because "universe" would be patterned content. This is before that. But that' just a language thing - if we say that the term "universe" means "all patterned content" then the universe is entirely within and made of that open field, then we can put that aside.

Whirlpools Reviewed

> >I believe this is the separation between those who believe we all are fundamentally the same "I", or "God" if you will, and those who believe we are fundamentally separate "souls" (one blanket per person). . . I tend to be in the former camp

I believe we can join the two together, and solve most of the problems you pose. We've already done it, in fact, we just haven't realised it. The whirlpools metaphor is great, but it has the difficulty of being "spatial" so it only goes halfway. (The blanket metaphor is identical in this respect. The whirlpools really correspond to localised little circular folds within the blanket metaphor.)

It leaves us with our the experience of the body, mind and world (specifically: sensations, thoughts and perceptions) appearing within the perimeter of the whirlpool. But... where do they come from?

If every person were to be an individual whirlpool, how do we perceive one another at all? How does that information "cross the space" between whirlpools? What are the boundaries of the whirlpool?

The answer is to reconfigure the metaphor a little.

Perspectives and the Enfolded

To say the "world is within you" doesn't just mean that the present moment sensory experience is within you. It really does mean *the whole world - all patterns everywhere - are within you right now* and you are actually experiencing it at this moment. However, only one aspect of it is "unfolded" as senses; the rest is "enfolded" into the background, simultaneously everywhere.

Metaphors:

- During day time we see the sun shining in the sky, we do not see the stars. But the stars are still there, it is the brightness of the sun that conceals them. Just so, visuals and sounds and textures conceal the subtle *global felt-sense* in the background of experience. This *global felt-sense* is the entire universe, summarised.
- Imagine a stretch of unbounded water. Waves and patterns within it, your gross experience. Now, take some coloured dye and place a drop into the water. From the perspective of the water:
    - ***Spatially****:* The colour is simultaneously everywhere, while being nowhere.
    - ***Temporally****:* There is no record of a time when the colour was not there.

  To take on the ultimate perspective of *awareness* is to take on the perspective of the *the colour* rather than the patterns within or structure of the water.

So let's return to being-a-person. Language will cause us problems here, but we can get halfway.

You are not a person, you are a *perspective*. An area of awareness, made of awareness, but unbounded (because it is non-spatial and non-temporal). Within every perspective is *everything*, enfolded. Because everything is enfolded everywhere.

Your present moment sensory experience is an *unfolded aspect or pattern* of the complete enfolded universe. Your *felt-sense* is your experience of that everywhere. If you think of yourself like this, as a "perspective" that is *tuned-into" a particular part of the overall pattern, then you can solve the other problems. If you release a hold on your present attention, you will find you relax and deepen as the unfolded aspect dissolves into the background of experience. The waves settle and you identify as the colour-that-is-everywhere, or the entire-sky (with both its stars = universe of all patterns, and its sun = present moment experience). Your present moment becomes unformatted, dimensionless, timeless.

The Overall Picture

The implications of this could be summarised thus:

- The only fundamental property is *awareness* or *being-aware*.
- The "universe" is all patterns in currently formed in *awareness*.
- A "person" is a "perspective" which has experience in the form of "unfolded" sensory experience and "enfolded" background experience.
- The "enfolded" background experience is actually the entirety of patterning everywhere. By which we mean "all existence" not just the post-big-bang universe we theorise in physics.
- All information is accessible to you, to be unfolded, because all information is everywhere, enfolded.
- Deep sleep or meditation corresponds to there being no unfolded content in your perspective.
- Death of the body just means those particular bodily sensations no longer appearing.
- True dissolving would mean the ending of the "perspective". But this cannot be comprehended, because the "perspective" is not spatially or temporally defined.
- Your absolute true nature is the true nature of everything: simply unpatterned *being-aware*.

Phew. That's my best attempt for now.

So, if we talk about selves and so on we are still talking about partitioning the content of experience in some way. I basically say "this part of experience is *me*, the rest is not". The "ego" is our identification with one part of experience and not another part of experience. Why is your arm part of you, when the cup is not, for instance?

The distinction is surely *arbitrary* and is simply convention:

- We make the distinction based on spatial proximity. Perceptions that are near the point-of-view are assumed to be "me". In particular, bodily sensations are assumed to be "me" whereas visual perceptions not near the body sensation are assumed to be "not me".
- We make the dissociation based on temporal proximity. I intend my arm to move, it moves shortly afterwards. However, I might intend all sorts of things - passing thoughts - all the time that arise as experiences later. I don't say I caused them and they are part of me, though.

- Things that seems to persist we identify as "me", things that are fast changing we see as "not me". For instance, body sensations and thought locations persist and recur; the scene around us changes dramatically all the time as we "move about".

All of this, though, occurs in the same "open space". (Yes, "perspective" is an awkward word and I'm not all that keen on it. I mean it more in terms of "assuming a perspective" or "taking a point of view" in experience. Unfolding *this* rather than *that*.)

Obviously, when you let go of all content then you are not really a perspective anymore. A perspective is something you temporarily become.

> >So if you clear your mind completely, you'll see that this ego was just another one of the experiences in this field of consciousness. Nothing fundamental. Just like what the ego thought was experiences happening to it.

Right. All that is fundamental is the *being-aware*. None of the *content* is fundamental, whether it is being experienced unfolded or not. And by content we mean both the current experience, the background facts of "this world", the broader patterns of "all worlds in existence". If you let go too far, you stop being/having an experience completely and totally dissolve as an apparent separation in *Awareness*.

> >The point is that the source of the feeling of "me" as an individual, is the same as the source of the feelings that make up "my mind", meaning no one but "me" can experience "my mind".

Different "spaces' could have the identical experience, maybe? Not sure on this. You could "take on the perspective" of my position right now. But this would mean you'd also be taking on the present moment in its entirety, including memories. So you'd actually just *become TriumphantGeorge*.

> >It's curious though, how it's always the same set of experiences that are unfolded. You don't go into deep sleep and wake up in a different room as a different person. And there's lots of different instances of such unfolding, each separate.

Well, you don't know this, perhaps. There could be a complete discontinuity in the arising experience and you (as an open space) might be unaware of this.

e.g. The experience of being a Japanese Professor could be arising - *experiencing from the perspective* of a Japanese Professor - and the next step you are *experiencing from the perspective* of Jonluw typing at the computer. Unless a memory was available of the previous experience (i.e. there were traces of the Japanese Professor Walking experience in the Jonluw Typing experience), you would not know.

> >I guess the point is when you experience the whole of it, you don't experience the individual perspectives that occur in it. What's difficult is for me to reconcile is that in some sense when I enfold my spotlight self and try to experience the whole, in some sense it's still jonluw trying to experience the whole, nlt the whole itself, since jonluw can recall the experience.

Right! For as long as you try to do this *while holding onto a point of view* you won't be able to. If you *do* release your hold on that point of view, however, this means when you re-adopt the perspective of Jonluw, you perhaps won't have the memory. If you let go of the Jonluw experience absolutely completely then you *may* reattach to another perspective. If you release too far, you may cease to be a partition at all?

The phrase "pure perceiver" might be a nice one to adopt for this discussion; it's the "most subtle perimeter". The three-dimensional camera, as it were.

> >See, I believe what we see as objects within each spotlight self experience, reflect some nature or behaviour of the field of consciousness.

Right. That we see consistencies simply means there are persistent generalised patterns, though. This is not to be dismissed; they are the channels along which the experience of "this world" forms, and while we are in that *context* then this is quite important! It means the world isn't subject to eternal, *independent* laws; it *does* mean that generalised regularities can be seen as incorporated within consciousness in the same way as the actual experiences.

> >Basically, I think the entire physical sciences are a very advanced form of the blanket metaphor.

Yes, the blanket metaphor says "there's the fundamental" and then "everything else is folds". Anything we observe or become corresponds to such pattern. The generalised regularities of science (as noted above) are such patterns.

> >So even though it's one continuous blanket, I can still identify and describe with physics, one relatively simple fold and one ludicrously complex fold.

Right. Physics, say, is an accounting of a particular subset of folds. (And also, as a subject and mode of thinking, takes the *form* of a subset of folds.)

> >Scramble these nerves, and there would be no jonluw. There'd still be a transcendental I, but the experience of jonluw would not be manifested in it.

Transcendental I (the blanket/property), pure perciever, perspective-of-jonluw, ego of jonlaw.

> >This is important because what we can see in our physical model reflects what is going on in the world of actual existence, consciousness.

Only a particular, greatly-reduced subset. And we have to be careful and not assign the human experience to other aspects. For instance, cups experience being cups, they don't experience "sadness". "Sadness" is a sensation in the body linked to various other perceptions and thoughts. Cups don't have thoughts and feelings. They have... ceramic. Cups aren't even "cups" as we conceptualise-experience them.

> >It is, however, easy to say something is spatially separated in the physical model. Not so much in the field of consciousness.

Right, although things are separated out in the *physical model*, they are not separated out even in experience or apparent reality, if you truly investigate it. Nothing is spatially separated, fundamentally. But when we think of things, we are forced to imagine them in some sort of extended space, in metaphor and in daily life.

> >For jonluw to experience what "you" are seeing as well as what "he" is seeing, the two sets of experiences would have to be arranged into one set. In the physical model, the brains would need to be connected with some seamless form of communication.

However, this is possible I think - having simultaneous experiences. And I don't think it requires literal brain connection. Remember, our "pure perceiving" isn't actually bound to brains or any particular structure.

> >However, with the help of the physical model we can see that consciousness arranges itself into complex structures, where "sound" only exists as a structure within that structure.

In fact, by *adopting* the physical model as the structure of you perception/mind, you directly experience this physical model as if stable and underlying. If you let go of that, it stops being unfolded in that manner and you have the raw *being* experience. Or, it has you...

A problem arises: You can't separate out the "physical model" from your patterned perception of "the world". And changing your physical model changes what you perceive. Effectively, your world *is* the structure of your mind. **This is *before* brains**. There's something else to cover here: Fundamentally, there is only the property of *being-aware*. Within that, patterns appear.

Immediately when we imagine this we are incorrect: we will tend to think of the patterns as spatially extended or interrelated, but this not the case. (*Space* in fact would be one such pattern, which might from the structure from which other patterns borrow.)

There are no limits on the form those patterns, although we cannot think of this. And there are no rules, inherently. Only temporary regularities. To describe a particular arrangement requires a language that corresponds to it for the duration that it persists.

Our physics codifies a certain subset of patterns (patterns of perception which exist as regularities in mind, persisting in memory, tied together within conceptual framework which also exists as regularities mind, persisting in memory, in a mutually-reinforcing relationship). Because it involves a shaping of mind and perception, it seems *obviously true* that we are describing an external, dependable world.

But we are not. **The world is not external, it is internal.**

However, the shifts in language required to describe one aspect of experience deny us the ability to describe - and even have - alternative experiences. We need to kill one point of view to shift to another.

[...]

> [Q: what do you think of the idea that there is one experiencing subject, entertaining multiple, simultaneous self-contained experiences? This idea is in a way the opposite of Parfit's resolution to paradoxes of personal identity. Instead of there being no enduring persons, there is one subject, this "blanket". Instead of never stepping in the same river twice, persons endure simply because the conscious property of the universe endures.]

That's pretty much where I'm going with that. There is only the blanket - the infinite nonmaterial material whose only property is *being-aware* - and transient patterns forming with it. There can be multiple, apparently self-contained experiences - shallower patterns within the perimeter of deeper patterns - and any number of them. Remember, though, that nothing is really separate. Any pattern can be said not just to be *made of* blanket, but to *be* "blanket". This is simultaneously everywhere, all-at-once. So in that sense, all patterns are available from within all other patterns if you drop down and quieten yourself to "blanket" level. Being a "person" could be to *be* your own localised experiential world. However, you would also *be* all other localised worlds *and* the non-spatial, non-temporal background. However, given the subtle structure we might call "perspective", we tend to focus on the immediate large clumpy sub-.patterns. If we completely let go of that though, "our" experience could expand to encompass it all.

Our present moment is experience is just what we have *unfolded* right now. One enduring *property* is all there is?

> >So it's more like the one property that's guaranteed to endure during survival.

Of course. I don't mean it's all there is right now - but it's the "basic thing that never goes way" so it's all there *truly is*. Which is reassuring because it changes our relationship to "stuff". If what we truly are a subtle "perspective" - needn't be annihilated if all the patterns of this world dissolve. Although we would cease to be this "person" perhaps. I'm not sure what "transhuman technology" would mean given that context though.

[...]

> [Q: *'An electron isn't conscious - rather it is consciousness. That's what it is made from, and everything else is too. All things therefore have being-awareness, the experience of being itself as itself.'*; This leaves us with the question: *what the fuck* is it like to be an electron?]

What is it like to be a human arm?

On the electron: If you could transfer and localise your attention and somehow *become just the electron* for a while then return, you would never be able to describe it. All your concepts are human-experience-based. What is it like to be a human in deep sleep? You do that every night. Try to describe the experience.

Fucking electrons.

[...]

Why are brains conscious and not arms? Is your arm inside your brain? When you are asleep, do you stop being a "mind"?

If sleep is supposed to be unconscious, what about dreams and lucid dreams? Is it more accurate to say that deep sleep involves a ceasing of there being something to be *conscious-of* rather than a ceasing of *consciousness*.

> >Now you're just shifting the definition of "consciousness" so that you keep panpsychism while leaving behind the original evidence and intuitions that helped you get to panpsychism in the first place.

Actually, you are right to some extent. But the wrong way around. Everyday panpsychism leads you to a perspective which forces you to kick away the basis of the original view, it having done its job. This is because you end up recognising that panpsychism's flaw is the assumption of a spatially-extended world. But you can't do this from the beginning.

However, I am careful in my definitions. That's where the whole *consciousness* vs *conscious-of* vs *self-consciousness* thing comes from. Remember, I am not OP.

[...]

> [A: Ladies and Gentleman, **the Chess Metaphor** (not invented by me):
>
> A very experienced chess player, is playing a game of chess with himself. No chess set is at hand, so he plays the game "in his head". This mental chess game can serve as a model of a (very tiny) panpsychic universe. It's panpsychic, because its ultimate foundation is the player's consciousness. It's also a model of a universe, with space (chessboard), matter (pieces), time (moves), and physical laws (rules of the game).

> In this model, there's just one *fundamental* consciousness, but we could imagine that being divided among non-fundamental consciousnesses: the roles of white player and black player; a pawn "trying" to get promoted; any "theme" in the game which is engaging the attention of the player. We *don't* need to insist, that every object we can name is conscious.]

Right, nice metaphor - differentiate between *made of consciousness* vs one part being *conscious-of* another part.

Every object has *being-aware* - it is what it is as it is - but that is not the same as self-consciousness and being able to take a stand as one part (chess piece) in order to manipulate another part. The human player has the whole chess board within him. An individual chess piece just has wood grain within him.

[...]

> >I question whether panpsychism does any of the work we want an answer to the Hard Problem to be doing. "What is consciousness"? "Consciousness is an intrinsic property of everything". Well...ok? Isn't this just an updated version of the homonculous, one of these infinite turtle regresses?

No, it skips that - it says that **consciousness is the *material* from which everything is made.** This doesn't mean everything is *self*-conscious though. Whereas "matter" at a fundamental material has no intrinsic properties at all, "consciousness" as a fundamental material has the of "awareness". It basically means you don't need to magic-up consciousness as mysteriously "emerging" at some stage of complexity. (What complexity allows is *self*-consciousness, of a particular structure being able to represent itself by having an "idea" inside itself. One part looking at another. This is what we casually just call "consciousness" usually, which is half the confusion.)

[...]

Just going to bash out a quick ramble here for now to keep things going. Some of the disconnect here might be that it is reaching for terminology to describe a foundation that is not itself an object - it is simply a *property*, something we'd come to - but can "entertain" objects.

> >You can build any number of complex, internally consistent, frameworks to defend any number of views, but there must be some basis for believing one over another, correct?

Yes, and this is exactly about anchoring a framework in that way.

> >So, why is the idea of a pure-perceiver relevant?

The source of this is an effort to connect the description of consciousness with the facts of direct experience. Rather than, say, just connecting it to another accepted framework, as is more common in this area. Hence the earlier hyphenations of *conscious-of* and so on. After exploring this (our direct experience), we end up identifying a basic experience which does not have a boundary, but has content appearing *within* it, with no discernible "outside" form which it comes. Further investigation reveals a non-gross background *felt-sense* which encapsulates the whole experience and can be to some extent "unfolded".

There is no sense in which there is a "thing" experiencing the content of experience.

The *felt-sense* and *next-step* corresponds to a variation on Eugene Gendlin's philosophy and psychology efforts; the *enfolded-unfolded* to David Bohm's implicate-explicate order model as described in *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*.

i.e. The concept of the "pure-perceiver" arises from the need to have a borderless context for subjective experience. The notion of enfolded meaning/facts is to provide a link between the structure of subjective experience (the behaviour of the context, the current moment, and the *felt-sense*) and an objective or 3rd-person description of the world (time, space, objects, etc).

> >I guess this comes back to my previous response to you, why is it that "Within every perspective is everything, enfolded"?

The short answer would be, there is nowhere else for it (the content of the world) to be. On the enfolded thing, it's in the following sense that the world is dissolved within the pure-perceiver:

> [Imagine a device that] consists of two concentric glass cylinders. Between them is a viscous fluid, such as glycerin. If a drop of insoluble ink is placed in the glycerin and the outer cylinder is turned slowly, the drop of dye will be drawn out into a thread. Eventually the thread gets so diffused it cannot be seen. At that moment there seems to be no order present at all. Yet if you slowly turn the cylinder backward, the glycerin draws back into its original form, and suddenly the ink drop is visible again. The ink had been enfolded into the glycerin, and it was unfolded again by the reverse turning.
>
> -- *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*, David Bohm

TL;DR: The "pure-perceiver" is fundamental and is the non-thing whose only property is *awareness* or *being-aware*, which means that it "is" awareness.

Reply to “David Chalmers' TED talk on "How do you explain consciousness?"”

I think the "inner movie" idea is a poor metaphor, even for a general audience like this, since it inevitably implies "content" and a "viewer of content". The subjective experience is more like *being an aware material* which "takes on the shape" of experience, and therefore all experiences are you experiencing yourself. It is in this way that "consciousness" is fundamental. *Self*-consciousness is something else: It is the identification with one part of experience as "you" and the rest as "other", from an expanded perspective containing both. In moments of no content (perhaps in deep meditation and the like), there is simply the experience of *being-aware* without objects or a "you".

> >I think the inner movie idea is a good conversation starters for people who haven't really considered the idea of consciousness and that this bad explanation actually opens the door to your better explanation.

There's something in this - stages of explanation, where each new layer begins with revealing the previous one as false - actually. Start with the movie explanation, then say you *are* the movie screen *and* the image, and then that they are one and the same. Depends what concepts and culture the person is familiar with. Problem is, though, that these halfway islands of explanation become the habitual way of describing something, with the next more-fiddly stage neglected.

[...]

> > Q1: *‘One would be better to trust their consciousness as real and true as oppose to any scientific theory which is simply a byproduct of the consciousness.’*; Is there a reason you single out scientific theories here? It seems like you should reject philosophical theories as well?
>
> > Q2: It sounds like a solipsistic notion to me. If I had to guess I would say that his/her position is that only one's own consciousness can be sure to exist. Scientific and philosophical theories as well as everything else cannot be objectively proved to even exist let alone trusted. The problem with this argument is that it is unfalsifiable. That is supposed to be the mark of a weak argument as Christopher Hitchens would say.

Problem is, perhaps, that something that is completely true might be unfalsifiablem - e.g. Everything is consciousness / everything is my consciousness. "Everything is made from matter" would be vulnerable to the same thing surely?

> >Saying "everything is made of matter" can be verified through experiment

I'm not sure it can, though? It's equivalent to saying "everything is made of stuff, the stuff that all experiments detect"? I follow the argument. What I was getting at is that the statement "everything is [made of] consciousness" basically predicts everything exactly as it is observed, including subjective experience. So - Perhaps a better judge of it isn't whether it is falsifiable, because "correctness" is built in in a sense, but whether it leads to a more coherent or intuitive framework than the alternative. (e.g. Not needing to fall back on the hope for "emergence", etc.)

> >Well the claim "everything is made of matter" is not perfect, but you could see if you were say something a little more specific...

It could only be made more specific by assuming a certain subset of matter, I think. Which means you'd be testing the properties of a *particular instance* of matter, rather than matter itself. The same I think applies to "consciousness", except "consciousness" has the property of *being-aware*.

> >How does that statement predict everything as it is observed? what exactly does "everything is made of consciousness" mean?

The quick way to suggest this would be:

- Consciousness is a "material" whose only property is awareness or *being-aware*.
- All things are patterns in and of this "material".
- Therefore all things are have *being*.
- This does not mean they are *self*-aware, in the sense of being able to reflect upon themselves or think or whatever.

In truth, it's basically materialism but with the property of fundamental *being-aware* inserted into the lowest level. If that makes sense. You get all the same "objective" observations, but you also get subjective "being", the ability to be *conscious-of, built-in with no need for emergence.

> >Experiments also detect space, time, energy, and information.

They don't detect those things in depend of matter. But you get my point, don't you? That the "unfalsifiable" has limit potentially when it comes to discerning the truth.

[...]

> > In this case, yes science and rationality I suppose. If anything though what about the consideration that it is the product of an *accumulation* of consciousness. That's an important distinction to make because it lends itself some more credibility if many believe it to be true. The act of accumulating the knowledge, whatever it may be, tends to weed out the erroneous ideas produced out of personal bias. Individually we make so many mistakes. It is called "being human" for a reason. If scientific discourse has been followed correctly, and I submit that this can be a big if, we should converge on some better understanding than what an individual compiles on their own.

Just to check here - are you using "accumulation of consciousness" to mean an accumulation of knowledge? I don't think consciousness can be accumulated - it is just the stuff our experiences are made from, no matter what form those experiences take. We might accumulated patterns and structures over time which become the foundations which channel and flow subsequent patterns and structures - that's what I'd call knowledge accumualtion - but consciousness itself doesn't accumulate. Just as making increasingly complex ripples in a puddle doesn't mean you are "accumualting water".

> > I think the point is that we believe others perceive the world in a similar manner as ourselves. Hence there is nothing special about our own individual consciousness which should cause us to believe our own inner experiences are more valid than others.

Well, what's more vaild is that our own inner experiences are the ones we, um, experience and can say definitely say exist, and study.

[...]

> >I can clearly feel myself existing within my body, it feels like my skull is a house and my eyes are windows and there is an entity (me) that is in the house.

Which is interesting, because it *can't* be true. In what sense are "you" housed inside the skull?

> >In the sense that "I" am not outside of my skull ??? :/

Surely that's not your actual experience though? So, light may go in your eyes and then travel along your visual cortex where the signals are interpreted and contribute to a "3d world" that you then perceive yourself to be in - but that whole representation is inside your skull. As in, the room around you is all inside your perceptual space - it's all "you". If you try and find the boundary between 'inside' and 'outside' right now, you'll find there's no barrier in perception - you don't feel a wall between the room and you, do you?

You *imagine* being inside a skull, but that's not your actual experience I'd suggest. (Hopefully that made some sort of sense.)

Top tip: Point to your "real" hand. If you are pointing to one of your hands that you can see, remember that that's inside your skull; it can't be your real hand. If you are pointing to your head, then the same applies: where is your *real* head? (Answer: If it exists at all, then it is completely outside this perceptual space.)

This is definitely an informative area to explore I reckon...

> >Ok in that sense, yes my mind is everywhere. but finally I have to logically say...

Thing is, it is a jump, because you never experience that outer world. Indeed, you never really experience a "self" other than a thought of one. You *suppose* your brain is making all of the external observations (and 3rd-person experiment suggest there is a correlation between brain areas and subjective content) but the fundamental background perceptual space itself cannot easily be accounted for in this way. It is not clear in what way that 3d experience is inside your skull; when we look inside we do not see a room, for instance.

> > it's the difference between a movie and the watcher.

What is the "movie" and what is the "watcher" in that metaphor? I suggest that upon examining your subjective experience, you will not be able to find a "watcher". If you think you do, then examine it further and you will discover you are perceiving it from outside of it - meaning it can't actually be the watcher of course.

> >... the only thing left will be "you". I like to call this observing entity the soul, at the moment most people are calling it the consciousness.

Right, the unbounded aware openness. I'd say most people are using "consciousness" to mean something a bit different, like the content or a notion of self, rather than this fundamental background. Which is why things get confused I reckon.

> >I cannot isolate the location of the soul...

Because it *is* what the experience is made from. Investigate any sensation or thought and you discover it is that too. Hear a sound in the distance, you discover you are both "over here" listening to the sound *and* you are "over there" beside the sound. It has no location, because it *is* the unbounded aware space in which experience arises, which *is* you.

> But yes this is an informative area to explore, although I understand that my metaphysical ideas are way out there,

Not at all - they follow naturally from a *direct, experiential* exploration of this stuff, rather than just *thinking-about*. If you conceptualise it as a space which *takes on the shape* of experience, including sensations, perceptions and thoughts, then you don't need to deal with the duality of experience and experiencer.

> ... my body would be doing all of the typing all by itself without any sort of conscious awareness like a robot.

Well, your body and thoughts and the world around you *all* seem to arise as spontaneous experiences, "by themselves". If you examine closely the way in which you "direct" these things, you will find you cannot locate the "doing" of them - only the experiencing of them. After all, when your attention becomes absorbed in the words onscreen, your heart doesn't stop beating. Hopefully.

> conscious awareness

Perhaps better to say *conscious-of* or *attention-on* for this usage, since it is a particular shape of experience adopted by the background awareness. Right now, isn't seeing just happening all by itself? And when you type, isn't most of that happening by itself? Only if you have over-focused your attention or if you have tensed up do you feel "effortful doing", I'd suggest.

> But that's the thing, there cannot be an experience without an experiencer.

Ah, we're only slightly disagreeing. I'm saying that there is only "the experience", by which I mean that you experience something by *being* it. Your awareness "takes on the shape of" an experience you are having. The apparent separation is a language thing. This actually plays to your "trees in the wood" thing. I'd suggest something extra, which gets around Berkeley's "God is experiencing everything and so keeps it existent" thing. That is, that you *are* experiencing the whole world right now, it's just that you are only experiencing part of it as a *sensory* experience. There rest of it is dissolved into the background, as it were.

The *facts-of-the-world* are here right now. When you walk into those woods are see the fallen tree, you are "unpacking" the tree from the background and into perception.

> through meditation I control my emotions and eventually my heart rate.

Right, it is all *potentially* accessible; you can unpack any part of the background (that which is not within current attention) and make it so, with a bit of practice and (importantly, of otherwise you block the route) belief.

> The truth is whenever I think a lot I can feel my brain getting denser like as though I'm flexing a muscle so yes I do feel a little effortful when thinking.

Is this not different?

There is a difference between *making thoughts* and *thoughts arising*, in response to an intention. Effortful thinking brings tension, because it involves a suppression and redirection, due to misunderstanding. You feel a pain because you are implicitly tensing up muscles in an attempt to control what arises. Although also, I think you can experience pain wherever there is "stuff that shouldn't be happening".

> >I then realized that I do in fact "exist" as an entity that was experiencing this depression and that I was running the boat that is my body. Through constant pessimism I had corrupted my boat to the point that it negatively affected the conscious observer (me).

You do exists as an "awareness in which experience arises". And if you screw up the spontaneous flow, block up those patterns, I think you can get into deep depression mode. Basically, you end up creating persistent structures that prevent movement. An approach to thinking of this:

- Experiences leave traces which "in-form" subsequent experiences.
- Thoughts are also experiences, and effortfully generating or allowing thoughts is equivalent to experiences them as events.
- Hence both bad situation and bad thinking will funnel your future experiences in that direction.
- It is possible to almost completely halt the natural flow of experience by doing this.
- The natural state is one of open allowing, with no trace accumulation. This implies that one should let thinking and action arise spontaneously, and direct your experience only *indirectly* - through intention.

Pessimism is (accidental) active programming of experience. Unfortunately, this means that to improve you have to choose to think and act in a positive manner - completely ignoring the evidence of the moment!

> >I do agree that there is a difference in our language, of course the experience and the "experiencer" are one and the same, I just meant that there is an entity within which all of these experiences are experienced. It's more of a ying yang, inner-outer world idea based on compatibilism, the soul does not have any solid boundary, the experience can go as far as the thought wants to go (this is where we might talk of auras). But finally all of this is experienced by a single central awareness which you can call as a soul.

Right. Unbounded. It's all 'within the aware perspective' I'd say. If you try to find where "you" are, you'll discover you seem to be everywhere, and that the world experiences arises within you. I think this *flipping around* or inverting of our usual way of approaching the world is quite key to having a direct understanding of consciousness.

> >do you perhaps believe in the immaterial soul ?

Not that's how I would describe it, but the broader idea, yes. We are "whatever is aware" and, not inside a skull, but rather "tuned into" an experience. It also not at all how clear how much of that experience is external to us. Now, there may well be philosophical zombies - not all "people" have consciousnesses looking through them, perhaps - but I certainly am not. :-)

I *am* consciousness, and the experiences I have appear within me. I am not "inside a body". I am having the experience of being a body. A philosophical zombie could potentially behave exactly as a human, without a consciousness being aware of it, if that makes sense. It's not about programming.

To cut to it: Do you believe that the "soul is in control" at all times? Do we finely manipulate our behaviour? Or are we mostly *aware* of it, with certain adjustments now and again?

> [Q: The word here my friend is compatibilism, The unified soul can be divided into the conscious awareness and the emotional subconsious (ying,yang), the conscious awareness is completely free to

> do whatever it may but the subconscious is extremely deterministic. The subconscious consists of these instincts that are in tune with the best approach in the chaotic world, this can be described as the brain activity that occurs before the person becomes consciously aware of it. It would really benefit the free will listen to this subconscious but free will is also the source of critical thinking and reasoning, the free will can freely choose to listen to the subconscious and access the different possibilities the subconscious has to offer or it can ignore it completely. But because it would benefit to listen to the subconscious we can track the subconscious on monitors and predict the outcome of the persons choice before he becomes aware of it. The choices that the free will makes also affect the subconscious which could later determine how future decisions are made. The subconscious can be described as all of the experiences inside and outside of your mind, it is everywhere and limitless, however the conscious free will being the source of this consciousness should technically exist inside of your brain.]

Yep, good summary! We can go into further details about the nature of the encompassing awareness, etc, but overall there, is after all, you-and-your-preferences + the world experience. There is no "free-beyond-this" will.

> >I have created this really crazy theory that shows that there is a subtle conscious force that permeates through the universe and this force is responsible for the creation and sustenance of life. Literally everything is consciousness ! The whole universe is an ocean of this energy and our awareness is like a whirlpool in this ocean.

There is a nonmaterial material whose only property is *being-aware*. Everything is patterns within this "awareness"; individuals are semi-localised areas in which their world appears. However, at a fundamental level, everything is everywhere and always, like the colour "blue" is the whole ocean, because at root there is no time or space division.

> >I feel like as though my mind is pouring out of my eyes and is enveloping everything around me, but at the same time the world is entering inside me.

Right, well I'd phrase this as that *you are* the background, so therefore awareness is everywhere (and all experience is made from awareness), and the apparent world arises within it.

> >The conscious awareness and the subconscious creativity together form the soul, If you don't mind I would like to go into chakras, because I find explaining this subject a lot more easier with reference to chakras

Although I'm familiar with chakras generally, I'm not really up on them being applied specifically. I guess I find it difficult to link their "physical" side with the less structured background idea.

> > The etheric feild interacts with the soul in a toroidal manner, just like magnet would considering that a toroid is a simple shape for an energy exchange in 3D space.

So, in this way, what is the "soul"? Or are we just talking about different 'types of pattern' within, and of, me? Is "energy" really just a movement, a shifting of patterns in consciousness then?

> >there is not a single part that isn't you really.

What are the implications of that?

> [Q: You can consider the soul to be the central observer. All of the inputs from the senses are all received and processed by a single awareness. The etheric field is also conscious and we are a derivation

> of this field, almost every religious person calls this field as God. To better imagine it, think of the whole universe as an ocean of consciousness and every single living creature is like a whirlpool in this ocean. This field divides and isolates from itself in order to have a different subjective experience on earth in the form of a creature, where human beings are the most complex of All creatures.
>
> *'What are the implications of that?'*; This is where things seem even more far fetched for you, I used to be an atheist myself, but atheism never really answered any meaningful questions, it was only a an idea of rebellion and nothing more. I used spirituality aided by my critical reasoning to help me get through my depression and it genuinely worked. Believe or not, but through spirituality I have left my body twice and now have a little command over the movement of the wind by tuning by body and mind with the consciousness of the wind. (yes I said I can move the wind, believe me if you want but I am having a lot of fun with my aerokinesis)]

Aerokinesis is a great word. :-)

I am an atheist in terms of an entity god. I am not religious. I am aware that all my experiences arise in a space of open awareness (consciousness) and is shaped from them. The best description is perhaps, that I am God taking on the shape or perspective of *being-Triumphant-George*. I am still everything, but my bright sensory experience makes me think that I am "here" instead of everywhere. It's as if I have my face pressed up against a window pane or I have VR goggles on. It seems that I am in that world and it is independent of me, and yet if I relax and detach a little from the show on display, I can somehow "feel around" and find levers and switches which influence the scene...

> [Q: Being an atheist is okay, I used to be one too. But never disregard your own consciousness, it is by far the most valuable thing that could have ever been conjured up by the universe. I used to be a hardcore atheist at the age of 12, because I learned that the earth was made by consolidation of mass through gravity and that could just discredit the existence of a creator. But eventually I realized that atheism was only an idea of rebellion, it never sought to answer the more meaningful questions of life and is content with nothingness. The multiverse theory that most atheists use to explain the creation of the universe eventually only became nothing but a gigantic assumption and just as far fetched as believing in a creator. I just could never logically accept that all of this order came from random chaos, I mean the shear amount of order that is present in this world really doesn't leave a lot of room for such random chaos to even occur let alone chaos being the main driver of the universe. Eventually I logically deduced the existence of God to be there, and slowly began establishing a connection between myself and God and tried to become "one with the universe". Eventually all of the answers for the most important questions of the world just became so apparent and crystal clear to me. Questions like why are we here ? why does evil exist ? what is the purpose of creation and of course telekinesis and some other cool tricks.]

I have a completely open mind - happy to have my ideas shift around. So probably to say I'm atheist jumps too far; I am a whatever-it-looks-like-to-me! :-)

I'm not sure there is a "purpose" though. If everything is for all eternity, the only purpose that one can imagine is eventual collapse back to infinite potentiality, from where it all begins again.

> [Q: The purpose exists in being, I mean think about it, if there was no purpose why would there even be an existence in the first place ? If things collapse back into the source then the purpose would exist

> in being, if there was no purpose there would be no being, there would be nothing to expand into and nothing to collapse into, just a purposeless dot. I later on realized that every element in existence exists with a purpose whether we understand that purpose or not.]

I follow you, but I sort of "put that aside" because I have no access to the information. I'm quite happy to have unanswered questions, if the alternative is to have a placeholder answer from logic only. Since we don't seem to retain memories prior to our lives (and it's not clear what is happening in cases where such things are reported), we are left in a wait-and-see position. Which isn't to say we can't probe the nature of this environment we're in, the nature of ourselves. It definitely seems less "substantial" than one would assume, and more responsive. Which again makes me wonder about a larger given purpose. I'm inclined to think there can't be a purpose from an eternal viewpoint, except fluctuation itself.

We can't *know* from this present perspective. It's in the nature of being a perspective.

Science, of course, doesn't answer "why?" or even "what?" it just answers "in what way". I can't answer purpose and so on. Those answers must be *direct* rather than thought about? However, the true nature of things is timeless and spaceless, it seems to me; this is a created experience by me, but not the "me" that I conceptualise (the thought I have *about* me), rather the larger background me in which experiences arise. All information is accessible potentially from that perspective. The localised perspective is a *filtering* rather than an identity.

> >etheric space

How would you define that? As the background conscious aware space which knows no boundaries but within which all things appear?

> >the ultimate purpose of existence.

Is the ultimate purpose not... just to create and explore?

> [Q: You may not realise it but you've pretty much answered most of those questions yourself. The etheric space is basically just as you have described, now you say that the perspective that you say is created by you, so does the whole world get created the more you explore it ? At the same time you cannot deny the identity of the perceiver because he is a creative observer. The observer creates and interacts with the world with his own "source" of being, because it all comes down to this, our minds are deeply interwoven with the rest of reality in an extremely intimate way, a machine can only analyse data no matter how complex you design it but a person is intertwined in the experience around as a single identity. You would now have to have two assumptions, say that you are not alive just like the rest of the universe or say that the rest of the universe is alive along with you, physically there is no difference between you and the rest of the universe and it is paradoxical to call yourself dead, so the most logical conclusion is that the whole universe is conscious in a way that we have yet to comprehend. The ultimate purpose of course being that the unified conscious force extended it's consciousness into manifestation to create this world and into us in order to have a more creative subjective experience.]

Yes, I pretty much agree with this; this is my view.

I would say that what I am is a consciousness, and that I am in effect exploring the memories of a particular world, from a particular perspective. (This is experienced as creativity, discovery, and creation-by-implication, which are in fact the same thing.)

Since memories are "made from" thinking and thinking is "made from" the consciousness that thinks, there is no physical world as such. And I am not physical. Furthermore, all this means there is *nothing special about "content"*. It's fun-stuff, explore-stuff, and it's all part of you. You're exploring your own mind. But that means you're also exploring every silly notion you might have. Don't take what you think-see too seriously; there is no "background solidity" to it. Finally, the "content" that suggests I am limited to being-a-person is just that: an imagining. Actually, I am always the entirety of consciousness, it's just that I am experiencing the sensory image of a limited perspective. My intentions are always global, even when my perception is local?

[...]

> >I can't help but feel that we have been incessantly agreeing with each other

I think we are! Same view with just different ways of describing it. Same reality, different metaphors kinda thing. Which is nice. :-)

The Big Guy?

> >I'd like to know what are your thoughts about God?

Hmm, I say: It's the name we use to describe the undivided experience, that which everything is made of and from and is. What people call "unconditional love" is the direct experiencing of that undividedness - which is a matter of ceasing to narrowly focus your attention on an aspect of content. The water analogy is often used: water and the waves. But I think it is more accurate to say that "God" and "consciousness" is the colour blue. In other words, "blue" is everywhere in water, water *is blue*, and all waves *are blue*. The only property "blue" has is... *blue*. Consciousness and God have the property of *being-aware* and no other property. All divisions, relations, patterns, forms, shapes, content and experience are 'made from' this *being-aware*. It is a "non-material material".

Whats On Tele? vs The Dissolved World

> >Would you believe me if I told you I practice telekinesis?

Of course! Everyone's doing it all the time, unwittingly. We think we "act" but we don't - we *experience actions*. :-)

-- Allow me to ramble a little...

We confuse the present sensory experience with the world. In fact, I'd suggest that the world is a set of dimensionless *facts-of-the-world* dissolved into the background of awareness. There is no distance between objects or events. Both space and time are *sensory formatting* just as colour, sound, texture is. They are part of experience, not of the world as it is. Sensory experience is like a mirage floating atop the true world, which is the shifting shapes of the sand dunes beneath (within a certain perspective). **And there is only First Cause.**

So, when we decide to raise our arm what we really do is "request the experience of arm-raising". At that exact moment, a pattern is triggered, and laid out before us, which we subsequently encounter as our attention passes over it. We call that "doing", but that act of creation already took place. Our "doing" is actually the experiencing of patterns already laid down.

When we attribute causes to effects, in actual fact *both* are effects - results from accumulated patterns created by will, deliberately or implicitly. If you want to lose weight, you might eat less and go running. But the eating less and running are just experiences; they have no causal power. It is the *intention* that these correspond to a later experience of weight-loss that produces the results (provided there are no contrary patterns).

Realising this, we find that *all* of our experience is directly caused - by the direct creation of patterns, partial aspects of which later appear in sensory experience. The only power is *will*, and *will* operates directly on the patterns. We "imagine that" the world is a certain way, and subsequent sensory experience falls in line with that.

The weather unfolds in exactly the same way as the raising of an arm, for the same reasons and due to the same cause. Usually we only identify with "local" experiences (content arising in the body-space area; content arising within an arbitrarily limited timeframe) but all experiences are "our patterns".

You might find *The Patterning of Experience* worth a read - it's one of my attempts to encapsulate this aspect of things.

-- Okay, ramble over...

He Sure Can Move!

> I can literally move shit with my mind!

So I'm gonna say the better way to say this is: Update the *facts-of-the-world*, which you then experience. You are changing the "fact of where something is". You never actually move an object (there's no such thing as a spatially-extended object when you're not experiencing it). I like that way of saying it because it's nice and general. It highlights that you can change "facts" that are the pattern behind your sensory experience right at this moment - or those that are supposedly not apparently here in "space" or in "history" or in "the future".

All the world is here, now, and available for change; Your sensory experience arises spontaneously in alignment with it, effortlessly.

> ...by just tuning my mind to the spirit of the wind and imprinting my spirit upon the wind.

Is the feeling of this for you a bit like detaching then "sensing out" the thing you want to change, sort of "becoming it", and then "shifting the shape of it/you"?

Loosely, I'd say that the structuring of reality is the structuring of experiencing - and this is the structuring of our minds. Which is very much the same idea, with different words, I suppose.

This is not a new idea - Immanuel Kant and others long ago said that things like "space" is more like a *sense* than a reality. And he basically says something like I do: the world is unstructured and dissolved and effectively an "infinite gloop". Which is really to say, it is nothing at all.

***We* are the order.** And behind order: nothing.

Quick note: When I talk of "metaphor" I don't mean that we can't literally make changes. I mean it in the sense of what I call "Active Metaphors" - that the metaphors you adopt to describe experience end up *shaping* that experience (described a little in my post about *The Patterning of Experience* elsewhere). In your case, adopting the idea of chaos and love has pre-formatted your world to allow such experiences to occur (in my thinking).

So, in terms of influencing the world, your examples are quite direct. By which I mean, you are dealing with objects and the environment that you can see and are present. Have you also experimented much with stuff outside of that, more abstractly? Like, experimenting with things which aren't restricted spatially and temporally (since space and time are part of the mind's experience, and not part of "a world"). This is where we cross over from being an "Entity God" (a located presence with power) to a "Fundamental God" (that which constitutes the world and creation itself).

At its root, this seems to be the story of "cause and effect" *vs* "direct will", of second causes *vs* First Cause. Of accumulated memories shaping subsequent experiences - and the tale of their realisation and dissolution!

[...]

Consciousness comes first becasue it is the material which takes on the form of experience. (Let's call it "awareness" maybe, since "consciousness" has multiple meanings - really we are talking about three ideas: consciousness, conscious-of, and self-consciousness.)

All other thoughts and content are shaped within that. It is before science, it is before metaphysics, it is before everything. It has no particular properties iteself at all - except the property of *being-aware*. Science is the study of "observed regularities in experience", inferring concepts via distinction and reconnecting them with relationships. What those regularities are "made from", it cannot say. That would be like trying to describe water as being "made from" waves. Not a "byproduct", then, but something that appears within it.

> [Q: *'It is before science, it is before metaphysics, it is before everything'*; does this mean anything? It sounds like poetry]

In the same way that "matter" is before atoms, and "colour" is before a painting, "consciousness" is before content. Actually, that's not a great comparison. Maybe "eyes are before seeing" and "water is before waves" - you can't describe water as being made from waves.

The point being made is that the reason it is difficult to study consciousness with science is that science deals with the observation of regular pattens in experience. Consciousness being *what those patterns are made from*, cannot be studied by it. Which is not to say that *self-consciousness* and the experience of being *conscious-of* something can't be studied; but that is content. The reason for the "form of thinking" above is that at this level you can't really say anything about this, apart from something like "consciousness the fundmental nonmaterial material whose only property is *being-aware*, everything else is patterns in and of this" - or similar.

Yes, the study of patterns we see in nature brings results - "observed regularities" - very successfully. For consciousness, though you hit it right...

> >The reason consciousness is beyond the reach of science so far is that we haven't been able to define or measure it.

We don't really observe consciousness at all, externally or internally; I'd say because it is not a *thing*. We only experience *being* it. (It is that which, in subjective experience, things are made of.)

So, as you say, we can't define it, we can't detect it with the senses - so it can't be studied scientifically. And nor will we ever, I suggest. (We might be able to study the self, and the content of consciousness, but not actual consciousness.)

Reply to “What is consciousness for? — Consciousness is a life-transforming illusion [Keith Frankish]""

This sort of theorising seems a bit pointless if we don't actual state what we mean by "consciousness". Several different sorts of things seem to get muddled in together, or mistaken for one another. From a subjective point of view, to begin:

- ***Consciousness-Of*** - A person's awareness of the content of an experience.
- ***Self-Consciousness*** - A person's identification with part of that content as oneself.
- ***Consciousness*** - A person's raw experiential sense of "being" or "presence" or "I-am-ness" which persists independently of content or identification, but which content seems to appear within.

The first we can explore as the correlation between environment, body and brain states, perhaps. The second with brain states and psychology, possibly.

The third is more problematic: The texture of it may vary with content, but the presence itself seems independent. And it can only exist in the present, since any reports of experiences *then* are reports of content (or the memory of content) *now*. It's a direct *fact* of experience, and it's probably the only thing we all know for certain. But it is not associated with any particular content, and so it cannot be studied by looking for correlation. It's an "isness" that precedes thought, and so cannot be funnelled through the division into parts and subsequent arrangements in mental space that theorising requires. Perhaps it cannot be captured by a story at all.

Reply to “The Simulation Argument""

The simulation argument is surely just a modern way of describing the notion that the *world-as-it-is* does not exist in the form that we experience it. In other words, it is not really a "spatially-extended world, unfolding in time". Space and time are aspects of experiencing rather than aspects of the world; they are more like "base formatting" of the human mind. The room next door is not actually "over there". The world then becomes more like a collection of "dimensionless facts" dissolved into the background of experience; a superposition of implicit patterns which can be unfolded into sensory form with attention. Which sounds like a mix of Bohm and Zen - the "background" would be consciousness?

--This comment is running on KantianOS v8.3 with the optional auto-dismissive module installed--

[...]

[A: *“Today a young man on acid realized that all matter is merely energy condensed to a slow vibration, that we are all one consciousness experiencing itself subjectively, there is no such thing as death, life is only a dream, and we are the imagination of ourselves. Heres Tom with the Weather.”* ~Bill Hicks]

Reply to “Philosophy is the quest 1) to discover the tacit assumptions that we operate on; 2) to critically examine those assumptions; and 3) to improve upon those assumptions by replacing them with better alternatives.”

> Q1: My favourite formulation is that "Philosophy is the black-box scientific investigation of human minds."

> Q2: Really? I'm not sure how metaphysics could be encompassed in such a definition. Or ethics. Surely the unreliability of the human mind is an obstacle that philosophy strives to deal with, but the mind is not necessarily itself the object of the study.

I *suppose* he might update it to say something like: the investigation of the *content* and *properties* of mind (by the mind). So in that sense, the mind is always the object of study, since all study is the study of appearances within the mind. Typically, we distinguish between two categories of content - "thoughts" and "sensory experiences" - but neither are outside of ourselves (as mind).

>Maybe it would have been clearer to say "brains" rather than "minds". (Incidentally, this is where "black box" becomes important - no neuroscience allowed.)

"Brains" is perhaps problematic though, depending on the context? Unless we are just using it in the loose sense of "the place where my thoughts appear", but I think that can be confusing when exploring certain areas. We never actually experience "brains" ourselves - only sensations, perceptions and thoughts arising in mind (where by "mind" I mean something like "awareness" rather than just "the place where thoughts hang out"). Maybe there is another term with less baggage that can be used for referring to "the context of experience".

/r/TrueAskReddit/

Reply to “Is life necessary for consciousness?”

> [OP: Do you think intelligence, or even life, is necessary for consciousness?]

Consciousness is primary, I'd say. It's not that things are conscious, it's that **everything is in consciousness.** That is different to *self*-consciousness, though, which is just a *thought-about* yourself.

> [Q1: So you are saying that rocks, trees, stars, planets, etc. are all conscious? What definition are you using here for consciousness? The normal definition given in the dictionary for consciousness is: ‘The state of being aware of and responsive to one’s surroundings:’; How have you determined that everything is "in consciousness"?]

No, they are not "conscious", they appear "in consciousness" and are made from it. (Reflective consciousness is one part of experience appearing within another.) So, instead of treating matter as fundamental, we say that consciousness is fundamental: it is the 'space' in which everything arises, and everything is made from it. You can experience this yourself, directly. Your experiences are made from consciousness. Then you ask: Where is the "me' that is conscious of the experience I am having? And: How is it possible for something other than consciousness to appear/encroach on consciousness? Or rather: How can we talk about what is beyond our experience? Basically, you just switch round from saying that matter is fundamental ('stuff' in space) to saying that consciousness is fundamental ('patterns' rather than things). Philosophical idealism + non duality.

Try this thought experiment [*Outside: The Dreaming Game*].

> [Q1: *‘No, they are not "conscious", they appear "in consciousness" and are made from it. (Reflective consciousness is one part of experience appearing within another.)’*; You have failed to answer what appears to be a fundamental question for conversation. I repeat: What definition are you using here for consciousness? The normal definition given in the dictionary for consciousness is: ‘The state of being aware of and responsive to one’s surroundings:’; How have you determined that everything is "in consciousness"?]

Apologies. The wikipedia definition is better:

> *Consciousness is the quality or state of awareness, or, of being aware of an external object or something within oneself. It has been defined as: sentience, awareness, subjectivity, the ability to experience or to feel, wakefulness, having a sense of selfhood, and the executive control system of the mind. Despite the difficulty in definition, many philosophers believe that there is a broadly shared underlying intuition about what consciousness is. As Max Velmans and Susan Schneider wrote in The Blackwell Companion to Consciousness: "Anything that we are aware of at a given moment forms part of our consciousness, making conscious experience at once the most familiar and most mysterious aspect of our lives."*

So, basically, the definition of "consciousness" is "awareness of something" or "that which is aware", or more simply: "awareness".

- ***Direct Experience:*** That everything (all experience) is in consciousness is something you can prove to yourself. If you try the experiment I pointed out, you find that - in your own direct experience - everything is within a space of awareness, and that you yourself seem to be that 'space'. Objects you experience turn out to be patterns within awareness. One supposes an external world made of matter, but one never experiences it, and one would have to invent a "conversion bridge" where the matter of objects was "converted" into the experience made of awareness.
- ***Philosophical Basis:*** The question of what is consciousness can equally be asked of matter. It's a case of which you choose to be fundamental. However, materialism has the problem of "how does consciousness arise from inert matter?" whereas idealism has no problem with answering "how does the experience of inert matter arise from consciousness". Consciousness is the "material" that things are made from. "Matter" are patterns/folds in consciousness.

The result is that, everything experiences "being itself". That does not mean it is *self-aware* - rocks do not "know" that they are rocks. However, rocks *are* a rock-like experience. Something like the brain, a much more complex pattern, has a more complex relationship within itself: parts of the brain can "experience" themselves relative to other parts of the brain (or rather, "experience patterns within themselves", such as seeing, hearing and so on). If the brain was "inert matter" we'd have to find the time/location at which consciousness appeared or emerged. If 'matter' is *made from* consciousness, then that problem is solved: consciousness experiences itself relative to itself, and objects and patterns within itself. Is life necessary for consciousness? No, consciousness is already present for life to appear within / arise from / be a pattern within.

TL;DR: Consciousness is not emergent, it is fundamental. Life is conscious because all forms are conscious. Increased complexity gives organisms the ability to have the experience of self-consciousness.

> [Q1: Thank you for your response. Is this essentially the problem of hard solipsism? So a rock is not something that exists objectively but only subjectively? If all things are simply experiences of things with consciousness, then how do you explain the experiences being so similar for different things with consciousness? Why wouldn't they have completely different experiences?]

It's a good point, and important. It's a bit "waves and the ocean". We are not talking about *your personal* consciousness - what you refer to as the content of your consciousness is really a pattern within the larger consciousness. Meanwhile, "everything is one", but waves don't necessarily get to see inside other waves, they only experience ripples that get into their own volume.

I tried to formulate a metaphor further down, here:

[[Q2: Two major possibilities for this, i.e. assuming the least:

1. **We are all one with the universe**. As Alan Watts said it perfectly, "As the ocean waves, the universe peoples." **We are the universe experiencing itself**. We are all extensions of the same thing. I actually lean towards this belief more, and even created a sub /r/UnitedWeStand around this idea. To quote Alan Watts again: We do not "come into" into this world; we come out of it, as leaves from a tree. We all come from the same conscious entity or universe, that has spread out into people.
2. *We are just here by chance*. The universe is huge, and through several billion years, we were formed out of it. There is no meaning to anything. We are not really alive. Science has never defined life or consciousness. All points to the likely hood that we are no different than a machine, that has fooled

> itself into believing that it is "alive". Why? Because frankly the alternative belief sucks. No one likes to believe that they are not special, no one wants to accept the idea that there is no purpose to life, no one really wants to admit to the fact that there is no one out there or within - no God, just pure nothingness - if you actually were to sincerely believe that, it is a scary thought. You are a lifeless matter that is strictly just chemicals interacting with each other. You are what you were before you were born - which is nothing - you just didn't exist. I mean, there was no evidence that there is consciousness before life started on this planet, so what makes us believe that it is actually something real? If you base it completely on science, there is really no need for a consciousness because everything is explainable without it. And frankly, the more you study the human body, the more we realize how similar we are to robots, and how much of what we take for granted as "consciousness" or "you" is just a biological machine.

These are the two possibilities I have come to, and either one is a good belief to hold. However, I lean towards the more optimistic vision, because frankly mankind is an incredible species, and it is difficult to imagine that what we are now, is merely order out of chaos, and nothing more.]]

Nice quote on Alan Watts. I agree with this. I think "consciousness" is fundamental, and that pattern and form (including us) emerges from it. The analogy of the blanket, where the blanket is "raw awareness" and ripples are "objects", is quite apt. How does the universe know itself? A blanket with no ripples could not experience itself, relative to itself. Only by 'taking on shapes' can consciousness experience itself.

We are such shapes. And our "self-awareness" is actually consciousness experiencing the folds within our human perimeter - what we actually are is not any of the things we experience, we are 'the space within which experiences arise'. (Just as the brain cannot experience itself from outside its perimeter, but can experience the things which occur within it, including a conception of itself.)

Think of a vast open space. This is raw, impersonal, open, unbounded, unstructured consciousness/awareness. Now within that, we have 3d structured space as a light 'ripple' or pattern. And within that, we have numerous objects and people - all as patterns in consciousness. Our brains and nervous systems are such patterns.

Our experience is of the content of our brains, the folded consciousness within the brain. The brain cannot experience itself, of course, because that would require being "outwith itself", but it can experience the patterns occurring within it. Our conception of ourself occurs within and as one of these patterns ("self" consciousness).

Which, incidentally, is why your "self" is an illusion. In your *direct experience* right now, you can actually "feel out" in all directions and realise that there is a "space of awareness" in which all content appears, *including your experience of your "self"*. What you 'really are' is the space (seen as 'a brain' in the 3rd person); the "self" you think you are is a thought/concept/pattern within that space.

But that's how you join the two perspectives. Look around you *right now*: your experience is that of a 'dream space' in which objects appear as patterns in the space.

That fact that one person (localised pattern) can't 'see into' another person (localised pattern) doesn't mean that there is only "you" or that you aren't both arising from the same background material-that-is-consciousness.

Furthermore, rocks aren't "in you" so much as they are "in consciousness" and their pattern creates a pattern within "you", which you experience.

TL;DR: It's not a personal consciousness, so solipsism isn't a problem. Furthermore, just because everything is consciousness, don't mean that one being should be able to directly experience that of another being.

> [Q1: *'Think of a vast open space. This is raw, impersonal, open, unbounded, unstructured consciousness/awareness.*'; I think that your use of words is losing me again. If everything is "made" from "awareness", what is the thing that is "aware"? From what I'm reading it sounds like you're saying that "awareness" (the material that everything is made from) is "aware" (experiences) itself. It seems like you've created a circular system where awareness creates itself. How is that not the case? Or if it is, doesn't that]

Yes, awareness is self-aware. Awareness experiences itself. When it forms into a pattern, it *is* the pattern and it *experiences* the pattern.

Crude analogy: The skin on your hand is "aware" but it can only experience itself by touching something. A hand held without contacting anything is "awareness" without content. A hand touching a table now has a sensation within awareness, it has content. I try to indicate this with the "blanket" analogy in the other comment.

Remember: We **begin** with this open awareness. Then it folds into patterns to form the **content** of awareness. Awareness experiences "itself" by forming into content and experiencing the content.

> [Q1: What reason do you have for thinking that this "awareness", that is self-creating/self-sustaining and produces the effects that we call the universe, actually exists? Or is this all simply a thought experiment?]

To contrast: What makes you think "matter" exists? Have you ever experienced "matter"?

I'll answer though: *because you can directly experience it [awareness], right now*. In fact, it's the only thing you can truly know exists. Everything else is inferred or *thought-about*. Again: it is the only thing you know, and that it is fundamental is the only way to explain it.

The Experiment

To be done from a 1st person perspective. In other words, don't think about it; imagine it actually happening to you, like imagining the feel of putting on a hat:

- Sit comfortably. Now imagine turning off your senses one by one:
- Turn off vision. Are you still there?
- Turn off sound. Still there?
- Turn off bodily sensations, such as the feeling of the chair beneath you. Uh-huh?
- Turn off thoughts. Where/what are you now?
- Some people are left with a fuzzy sense of being "located". This is just a residual thought. Turn that off too.

You're still there, you realise; you are a wide-open "aware space" in which those other experiences appeared. *You know that you are, and what is within you, although you can never apprehend yourself.*

> [Q1: Fair question. I think matter exists because I trust my senses to give a mostly accurate understanding of the world external to my body.]

But you don't experience matter, do you? You experience sights, sounds, sensations, and so on. You might have a concept called "matter" and say that's what is "behind the scenes", but you don't experience it.

> [Q1: Either I asked my question poorly or you are sidestepping it.]

I think I see where you are coming from there. Okay, I'll try again and maybe tell me which bits aren't making sense? I say: All that you truly know exists, is *awareness*. Everything you experience, including your experience of a "little self", also appears to be made of awareness. *The only thing you ever experience is awareness.*

Can you imagine ever experiencing something that is not made of awareness? What would that something be made of instead? This is why I say that it is the basis of all things, because it is all I or anyone else has every experienced. Itself, awareness is not an "object" and so isn't experienced as a "thing", but the patterns it forms *are* experienced as "things" that I experience. Solipsism isn't a problem, because having established that things are made of awareness, are patterns in awareness, I am not saying that one pattern (brain) has access to the internals of other patterns (brains), however I might reasonably infer from observed behaviour and how it corresponds with my own behaviour that others of similar form have a similar experience to my own - as partial patterns in the larger awareness.

> [Q1: So again, I have to ask. What makes you think that this "consciousness/awareness" which you are saying is the basis of all things actually exists?]

Short answer: From my direct experience. I actually experience this background directly, right now. If I point 'my attention' in the direction opposite to the way my eyes are looking, I experience a big, non structured space that goes on forever (where my "head" would be). Anything else I can conceive of is also made of this; I can't conceive of something not-awareness. Strictly speaking, only the content of awareness "exists", because unstructured open awareness without pattern isn't an "object" or "thing", it just "is".

> [Q1: Thank you that was actually much clearer. So based on your response, are you a metaphysical solipsist? And if not, why not?]

No. Solipsism would say "there is only me". I would say: There is not *even* me (as a separate individual as we would normally conceive of it). Solipsism would say "no reality exists other than one's own mind". I would say, "reality exists in a larger mind [so to speak], of which this localised perspective is but a part, a pattern within it". However, I admit the problem of intersubjectivity, that as a "wave" I don't experience the content of other waves, only the fundamental background going on forever and the patterns which appear within this localised "whirlpool" of "my" experience, some of which are the experience of the patterns of other waves.

EDIT: In other words, I am *inferring* that this is not a state of *subjective idealism*.

> [Q1: *'Solipsism would say "there is only me". I would say: There is not even me (as a separate individual as we would normally conceive of it).'*; No, metaphysical solipsism would say that the only things that exist are the experiences in your mind, which you've already stated are the only things that you know to exist.
>
> *'I would say, "reality exists in a larger mind [so to speak], of which this localised perspective is but a part, a pattern within it".'*; Ok, why do you think that more than your experiences exist?]

See my edit - I admit this.

Actually, it's currently the subject of some discussion. So my previous comment is my "where it's at, temporarily" position. Even access to other's thoughts, for instance, those thoughts or intuitions would appear within 'this open space of awareness'. Based on evidence alone, it is perfectly reasonable to say: "In this dream-space, everything is awareness, and everyone, including 'little me', is a 'dream character' - it just so happens experience takes the perspective of 'little me'."

Perhaps that's an interesting area: The usual argument against solipsism is that people behave as if there are other people. In my view *there are not even other people, because there is not even me*. So you would still interact with other characters, because you are having fun 'playing the part of your character', whilst really being 'wide open space'. In fact, you are all the characters, fundamentally, on a sort of "time share" basis...

QUESTION: *If you are the dream, then does solipsism go away as a problem?*

> [Q1: So from my perspective you would agree that there is no way of solving the question of metaphysical solipsism. But, like other non-solipsists, you make other assumptions which inform your view of reality, for example that there are things which exist independently from yourself. I'm with you at this point.]

We are in agreement. One might say we make "assumption of convenience", simply because it's nicer to live life that way. I assume I am a "person" when I am not - the "person" I am is an idea that is experienced occasionally in awareness - and I assume there are "other people" because it's nicer than if there are not.

> [Q1: How do you go from, the only things that I know to exist are my experiences and I'm assuming that there are things that exist independently of those, to and those things made of awareness that is aware of itself?]

I am on solid ground with the "all there is, is awareness", because supposing an "external reality" it would have to be made of the same thing. In other words, I know "my" own experience is made from awareness, so even if my experience is affected causally by patterns outwith my direct experience, they must also be made of awareness in order to have an effect. However, it is true that patterns could simply arise "uncaused" within this 'open space', or with myself as first cause. So whether there *are* such outwith-patterns is like the case with other persons. The basic *provable* position is that of subjective idealism + non dualism:

- There is an open space of unstructured awareness.
- What I "really am" is awareness.
- Content that appears within that space (the "world") is patterns in and of awareness.
- This includes the concept of being a "person", which is simply patterning thought on top.

The rest are niceties, overlaid. So *non-personal solipsism* is the fundamental starting point: There might be nobody else, but there's no me either. From there, we infer. But our inferences are experienced directly - if they are accepted we do actually *experience them directly as true* rather than experiencing and thinking so. *The thoughts are overlaid.*

EDIT: "Aware of itself?" That's not quite right maybe. Nothing is aware of itself. A space of awareness could only be aware of patterns *within* itself. Perhaps "aware of being the pattern it as formed" is a better phrasing? There's no subject/object as such. Hmm: language!

> [Q1: *'I know "my" own experience is made from awareness, so even if my experience is affected causally by patterns outwith my direct experience, they must also be made of awareness in order to have an effect.'*; This is the part that interests me the most about your position. How have you satisfied yourself that other things than yourself, are made of consciousness? That they must by made of it?]

Well, by exploring my direct experience. Not *thinking-about* but directly *attending-to*, I can confirm that my current experience is made directly of consciousness/awareness. All objects, all thoughts, all sensations. There is nothing else. So, what else could there be? Other than things I imagine. Which will then themselves be patterns in and of awareness. In other words, if there is something outwith my direct experience, affecting it, to do so it must also be made of awareness. In a way, the overall notion isn't much of a big deal. We are simply inserting "awareness/consciousness" as a fundamental level, such that stuff such as "matter" are patterns in consciousness. Much of the world-view remains identical, with some of the same philosophical problems (solipsism), reconfigured. But the mind-body problem goes away.

Adding to this with a little summary.

What I Know

From direct observation:

- What I am is an unbounded open 'dream-space' which is aware/awareness.
- That space takes on the shape of experiences. Experiences are made from awareness, are patterns in awareness.
- Those experiences tend to be in terms of a particular 'perspective'.
- One of those experiences is the concept of "TriumphantGeorge" which arises from time to time. Upon investigation, "TriumphantGeorge' is just an idea, an occasional thought. "TriumphantGeorge" is effectively a 'dream character' in the dream.
- I am in fact the 'dream space' *and* the content of the 'dream'.
- Experience is *impersonal.*

What I Conclude

It follows that:

- I never experience anything other than awareness. I cannot conceive of anything that is not awareness.
- I can never perceive anything outwith awareness. I cannot imagine how something that is not awareness could cause a change in awareness.
- I conclude that all that is, is awareness / patterns of awareness.
- I conclude that there is no "external solid world" beyond awareness.

What I Infer

For life convenience:

- That other 'dream characters' are similar in nature to "TriumphantGeorge".
- I treat "TriumphantGeorge" as a legitimate *person* and do the same for other people, because it's nicer that way. Also, according to what I know - that I am the 'dream space' and all that appears in it - they are a part of me anyway, just as "TriumphantGeorge" is.

Extra Stuff

This obviously impacts the notions and utility of:

- Intention, free will, cause and effect, etc...

[...]

Is life necessary for consciousness? Question over at TrueAskReddit. I've offered a couple of responses myself.

> [Q2: Without consciousness you could not be alive. Consciousness is life.]

But, the question was the other way around. Can there be consciousness without life. As in, if there were no people and no animals and no plants, would there / could there still be consciousness? Fundamental to idealism.

> [Q3: The Solar System formed 4.6 billion years ago from the gravitational collapse of a giant molecular cloud. It is safe to say that 5 billion years ago there was no consciousness, unless you want to believe that molecular clouds are conscious. If molecular clouds are conscious, then water is also conscious. So next time you are thirsty, don't drink anything, unless you are a sadist. The brain is a complex collection of material molecules that produces the illusion of consciousness.]

Were you there? ;-) You are confusing consciousness with self-consciousness.

> [Q2: Obviously there can. That's what Idealism is. During an NDE people still know that they exist though may not identify with their character. We confuse life with life forms.]

Well, obvious to us, but not the person who asked the question in the TrueAskReddit. If you are an (unknowing) materialist, it's quite a perplexing notion.

> [Q2: Consciousness is creating reality in each instant. There is no 4.2 billion years in the past. There is only now. There is just the appaearance of billions of years of "the past". It's interesting how they consider Idealism to be perplexing but "brain creating consciousness" to be so obvious.]

Yes, but it's pretty hard to accept "ideas as primary" just as a concept, when things are so obviously "solid" and "object-y".

Metaphysical Speculations

Reply to “The Problem with the Impersonal Oneness Paradigm.”

> [Q1: "I still find oneness metaphysically creepy. I keep thinking about the nirvana paradox: If nirvana is so great, why does God create? James Austin's first koan asked: ‘When all things return to the one, where is the one returned to?' Good question. The reduction of all things to one thing is arguably a route to oblivion; one thing equals nothing. The Hindu sage Ramakrishna no doubt had this in mind when he said, ‘I want to taste sugar; I don't want to be sugar.'" -– John Horgan]

Some thoughts:

- Nirvana isn't "great", it's just another state. I might feel good because there's no sense of division, but it's not inherently "better".
- "The one" isn't a thing that can return to anything; it's not an object. It is "that which takes on the shape of experience". One experience is as good as another. The experience of "no division, no content" is just another shape that "that" can take on.
- Our Hindu sage would have been better to say: "I want to take on the shape of 'the taste of sugar', not the shape of 'being a sugar-cube'".

If you think of yourself as an "undivided open awareness" which can take on the shape of any experience, then it becomes clear that having a being-a-body-in-a-world experience, is no less of an experience than being-unbounded-infinity-forever. "Who and what you truly are" is that-which-becomes-an-experience, and this is something that never changes regardless of the particular experiential state which it is at any given moment. You can never become less, or more, than this, just like a physical body can never becomes less, or more, than it is by adopting different postures.

There is a difference between a paradigm and an experience. In my view, all this Mind@Large stuff is just yet more conceptual patterning, albeit leading to perhaps more pleasant conclusions when it comes to living.

All experience are equally valid as experiences, just as Peter says. Experiences aren't "right"; they just are. However, some experiences, some paradigms, are perhaps more enjoyable than others. And a shift in perspective can even change what counts as enjoyable, even when nothing else has changed, because the meaning of the experience has changed - a context shift.

And a shift in perspective is what is required here, as a direct change in actual experience, rather than your thoughts-about it.

It's something like this:

- One day you are walking along the street, you body moving, the street around you.
- Suddenly you notice that the "place you are looking out from" is a big blank void.
- Directing your attention in that direction, you see this "formless space" goes on forever. Hmm!

- You direct your attention elsewhere, and notice that this "formless space" seems to go in every direction, and it's like the "background" from which your 1st-person experience is "shaped".
- Taking the perspective of that background, you realise that you were not a body walking along the street - instead you were always an "open conscious perceptual mind-space" in which sensation, perceptions, and thoughts arose (or "condensed from the background").
- The content of the experience remains the same, however the context and meaning of the experience is different.
- You directly experience that everything comes from and is "made from" this background, which is "you".
- However, this is not a personal you, since the "person" you assumed yourself to be is really just a concept, a thought, which is tied to a particular set of body sensations (specifically, you notice, a fuzzy sensation in the head area, somewhat behind the eye region).

You then start thinking-about this direct knowledge, and maybe you come up with concepts like Mind@Large to explain to yourself where the rest of "the world" is when you aren't looking at it, and what "other people" are. But really, that will just be you making stuff up. The truth is, the rest of the world doesn't "happen" in the same form that your present sensory experience "happens". However, you might then notice that the conceptual frameworks you adopt do seem to shape your ongoing experience somewhat - such that the apparent world-narrative aligns with your current outlook - but that's another story.

So, hopefully I've conveyed the difference here: The so-called "Oneness Paradigm" arises from a direct realisation, and is an impoverished way to try to capture that direct knowledge in words. In that sense, there's not much to argue about here. You can't realise intelligently criticise a painting (other than in terms of its technical construction) if you have't seen what it is meant to be a painting of.

[Q1: I don't think you can have it both ways.]

Of course you can. Just as in normal life, meaning depends upon perspective. You are conflating two things: fundamental truth and relative truth. The metaphor of the TV screen:

- No sequence of images on a TV screen is inherently "better" than another; it's simply a different arrangement of colours.
- However, if one particular colour-arrangement is one you have identified with, then you might like that arrangement to persist.

So imagine that you have identified yourself with a particular image arrangement. You live your days in fear of its disappearance. One day, you realise that you are actually the screen, not the arrangement. That would be better, as an experience, because all experiences would be re-contextualised. Fundamentally, it would be no different, actually nothing changed: images made of light. But you would be less fearful, in terms of the story those images are telling. All states of consciousness are supposedly equal, but a shift in perspective or consciousness to greater awareness is preferable. To reiterate, you are mixing two things up. In this sense:

- Equal = equal in nature and ultimate meaning.
- Preferable = preferable in terms of relative meaning.

Oneness isn't a paradigm as such - it is something which is experientially true. Like the hardness of a table surface, for example. You can theorise all you want about "hardness" and "softness" and their relative benefits and cultural meaning, but the fact of the experience of hardness doesn't care about any of that. It just is.

> [Q1: Your analogy assumes that we are the TV screen and are simply identifying with a particular image (self) on the screen. I understand that this is your view but it's not substantiated. I prefer the Flatland analogy -- we are higher dimensional beings and only a portion of our true self is able to penetrate into this three dimensional world. At death, we re-unite with our greater "self." This self continues to grow and evolve depending upon how we live and what steps we take to awaken to higher (more encompassing) consciousness.]

That analogy was just to illustrate the fundamental/relative issue. The actual description is the one I described previously: an open aware space in which "all patterns are dissolved" and we "take on the shape of" particular experiences. We are not "higher-dimensional beings", we are non-dimensional spaces. The idea of a "self" which reunites and grows and evolves is all very lovely, but is almost the definition of "unsubstantiated". Where is this self? What is it, exactly? How, exactly, does it reunite? What does it grow and evolve towards? Why doe show we live matter? How can consciousness be "asleep" and need awakened? All of those questions go away, if you flip to the perspective which actually corresponds to your direct experience if you investigate it.

> [Q1: You say that I am conflating fundamental and relative truths. I don't think so. The problem is, "fundamentally," nothing matters in your paradigm. We all join the same undifferentiated consciousness at death no matter how we live. This hardly leaves any value to the supposed "relative" truths that are subsumed by the overall nihilistic nature of this paradigm.]

Actually, it doesn't say that about death at all. The conclusion would be more likely be: Experiencing continues, forever. The nature of relative truth is, of course, that it involves one part of experience having a relation to another part of experience. So it is not the ultimate truth. The ultimate truth is not about an experience, it is about the nature of experiencing itself. Think about it for a moment: what experiential content could you ever have which would be "a-ha! that's what it's all about"? There would always be another experience you could have after it. It's case of "after the dream... more dream". Truth cannot be content-based, because content is ever-changing. Now, I realise this might sound depressing - "there is no fundamental meaning in the content of experience!" - but actually that's where the direct experience comes in. Because the raw open experience is of undivided wholeness, of all parts joined together - it's the solution to every problem, in a way that evolving parts strives for but can never provide.

> [Q1: It seems as though you are claiming to have a conclusive paradigm.]

Not really. What I'm actually claiming is that "paradigms" are relative too, since they are also content. I suppose you could claim that this is the "paradigm of no paradigm", but really it's a stepping back from paradigms. As you indicate, it's essentially (amongst other things) the recognition that language cannot get us anywhere final. But since thinking is also content, we never would have expected it too, surely.

When I say there's the nature of experiencing and there's the content of experiencing, that content includes both sensory experience and thinking (which one might view as "shadow-sensory"). There is no way to think your way out of this, because that is always "inside" experiencing: it's another experience. Any ideas we have about higher planes and evolving consciousness and all that - it's just more imagining.

If it is true that experiencing continues on and on, then there can be no fundamental meaning to it other than simply that experiences exist. And if they don't continue on and on - if experiencing ceases - that also means there was no fundamental meaning to it.

> [Q1: Let's turn this conversation in a more practical direction. Under your paradigm (or the paradigm of no paradigm as you call it), what are the recommended actions, lifestyle, and techniques? Is there a better and worse way to live? Is there a state of "mind" or "being" to attain, and if so, what does one do to attain it?]

There's no inherently better or worse way, there's just a difference of understanding - and there are potential benefits to understanding, although they are not always welcome, especially if only partially realised. Everyday comparison: It is better or worse to see the world in terms of atoms? But this understanding is direct, because it's about experiencing itself rather than conceptualising experience. And practically - If one wants to live from a greater understanding, then one must spend time attending to the nature of their experience, directly, rather than just thinking about it (because the it is in the end known-by-experiencing rather than developing a descriptive framework). Having this experience tends to loosen up how you might view the "habits" of your world, and how they might be changed. Your notion of what objects and so on, changes, just from the understanding. But from that moment on we enter an interesting area: because we can see how adopting a paradigm actually shapes our experience. (I call them "active metaphors": the narrative you adopt literally "themes" your apparent world.) Which further emphasises that paradigms are relative truth only - shifting patterns which filter or shape other patterns.

Meanwhile - Wilber takes much the same view as I do, I would say. The "sum of the shadows" = the total content of experience. Getting out of the cave involves directly perceiving the nature of experience. The content and the nature are "one thing", in the same sense that a blanket of material and the folds in it are the same thing. The Absolute (the blanket) vs The Relative (the folds), as one another.

> [Q1: Do you at least concede that embracing the Oneness/Monistic paradigm has a likely effect on how a person would live that might be deleterious if it turned out that your paradigm was wrong?]

The important thing to realise here is that it's not a belief, it's an experience. And in fact, arising from that experience, arises a generally compassionate view of others, because they are literally experienced as being within you, as part of you.

> [Q1: We can debate about what "getting out of the cave" means. I don't view getting out of the cave as meaning realizing we are all part of some undifferentiated consciousness.]

This doesn't say we are part of some undifferentiated consciousness; it circumvents that, basically. But I'll tell you, you can debate about "getting out of the cave" all you want, but it's a waste of time. The whole point of the cave metaphor is that the thinking you are doing about it, is an aspect of the cave. This whole conversation you're having with me, is just creating yet more shadows on the wall, so to speak, and to no great end. Until you take the step of turning around to the light - and this may even have been quite a "literal" part of the metaphor, since redirecting your attention towards "the place you are looking out from" is one way to directly realise this - you are just messing around with shadow-sensory inventions.

> [Q1: Do you simply reject the credible NDE and reincarnation accounts which consistently speak of a separate self that continues after death?]

Not at all, they support this description: after the dream... more dream. Experiencing continues, content keeps unfolding. There's no "separate self" involved though, as such. The "separate self" is the open aware space I have been referring to; that which is before content and takes on the shape of content. It's like a TV channel that never stops show programmes, each one being associatively connected to the other. The mistake is to think that the unfolding story has meaning beyond of the internal relationships within the experience.

> [Q1: And of course, I'll end with a quote: *"We are not primarily biological, with mind emerging as a kind of iridescence, a kind of epiphenomenon at the higher levels of organization of biology. We are hyperspatial objects of some sort that cast a shadow into matter. The shadow in matter is our physical organism. At death, the thing that casts the shadow withdraws, and metabolism ceases. Material form breaks down; it ceases to be a dissipative structure in a very localized area, sustained against entropy by cycling material in, extracting energy, and expelling waste. But the form that ordered it is not affected. These declarative statements are made from the point of view of the shamanic tradition, which touches all higher religions." --*Terence McKenna]

But I think you do not understand the quote! That quote is a very nice way of saying that: upon apparent death, the current experiential patterns dissipate ("Material form breaks down"), while the awareness in which they arose persists ("But the form that ordered it is not affected").

Again: You are like a "blanket of material" whose only property is awareness, which takes on the shape of experiences as "folds" within itself. When the current experiential path ("being Kevin in this world") runs out of plausible next-moments, it will turn into another path, and so on forever.

> [Q1: Is there no concession of the possibility that your view could be wrong?]

The way in which it would have to be wrong, is in the sense that, having seen the colour blue, you later hadn't seen the colour blue after all. Or not even. We are talking here of a direct experience prior to its interpretation - although of course in order to discuss it in language now, I am having to codify it, using metaphors to point to this.

> [Q1: we all simply end up part of the Whole no matter how we live.]

You don't end up being anything. You already are "the whole". It doesn't matter what experiences you have, it'll always be the case. It never changes. It's like (using a physical example) no matter what you see, you still see with eyes. The problem here is, you are still thinking of yourself as being located in some sort of spatially-extended environment. This not the case.

> [Q1: as being "hyperspatial objects" implying that we are separate selves which "cast a shadow into this world" implying the Flatlander paradigm.]

We are not any sort of object. No object can experience another object. And dimensionality is a conceptual construct. Fundamentally, I think the problem is this: you are in some way assuming you can think your way to the essence of your situation - but all you are ever going to end up with, is more thoughts.

> [Q1: "It ain't what you don't know that gets you into trouble. It's what you know for sure that just ain't so." -- Mark Twain]

An excellent quote. Which again speaks to my description here: what we are talking about, is the thing before content. You don't know it (in the sense of it being something that is correct or not), you just are it as an experience. Like (as I've said before) the experience of the hardness of a table's surface. It is just... true. But it is the context of all experience, independent of content, and it is always true. Now you may argue that maybe after you die, that changes to something else. But the problem here is, it has no properties of its own other than existence. Any experience you talk about or any thought you have, is "made from" this. You can't get out of this... what ever you do, will be "inside" this, even your imaginings and thoughts about an outside, will be inside.

Let's continue... (I'm enjoying our discussion, by the way; don't be put of by my declarative approach)

> [Q1: I understand that you are focused on the "experience" and therefore want to declare that the fact of "experiencing" is undeniable, but you are also drawing inferences and conclusions from experience.]

You'll need to be specific here, really. But we could maybe make the following three statements:

- Experiencing is absolute.
- Content is relative.
- There is no "outside" to experiencing.

Everything beyond that is a discussion about content.

> [Q1: A materialist would simply argue that your experience proves nothing more than that your physical brain is firing synapses.]

He'd have trouble arguing that, I suggest.

> [Q1: <*You don't end up being anything. You already are "the whole"*.>; But you categorically state the above as if you are absolutely certain of it which you can't be. Why not concede that? Why the Monistic fundamentalism? Why is there a downside to other people embracing a faulty paradigm but if it turns out the Oneness/Monistic paradigm is wrong, there's no downside? It seems very convenient. I just don't see any humble concession here to the effect that "our paradigm could be wrong and if it is, there could be negative consequences as a result of embracing it."]

If you are never going to experience an "outside" to experiencing (because such a thing is not possible), then you are the whole of your experience. Remember, this says nothing about the content of your experience - as in, what sort of things you can experience "as if" they were true. I'd say this is an observation, rather than a concept or part of a paradigm.

> [Q1: In my view, we have to transcend thought and contact or awaken that part of ourself which is eternal/transcendent/outside of time.]

The idea that a part of you is "asleep" is problematic I think, or that there are separate areas which can be "contacted". I'm going to suggest you flip this around, and we'll use the following metaphor:

- All possible patterns of experience exist, and are present and active right now, dissolved in this "perceptual space" that you are.
- They differ only in their relative intensities, more intense patterns contributing more to your experience than less intense ones.
- One might think of these patterns as "facts", ranging from the precise to the very abstract, to division and to relationship.
- Nothing "happens" other than observing.
- In other words, "the world" doesn't "happen" behind the scenes, it is a superposition of dumb patterns or facts.
- For example, one such pattern would be "3D space" and another would be "time passing".
- The world has no depth.

In this way, nothing is hidden or awoken. It's all laid out already, like a body of all possible postures, which is currently in a particular arrangement, with attention on one part of it to the exclusion of others.

> [Q1: "You triumph over death, not by living forever, but by living timelessly, by being present to the Present. You are not going to defeat death by identifying with the ego in the stream of time and then trying to make that ego go on forever in that temporal stream. You defeat death by finding that part of your own present awareness that never enters the stream of time in the first place and thus is truly Unborn and Undying." --Ken Wilber]

There you go. That's what it's all about. That directly experienceable background context to the ever-changing content. Have you ever done that Douglas Harding pointing experiment? There are better approaches, but it's nice and quick.

> [Q1: I take nothing personal. Hope you don't either.]

Of course not - it's all part of the fun of discussion!

> [Q1: You guys just simply don't think there is any way you can be wrong. The human minds desire for certainty and closure is one of the biggest obstacles to truth.]

I think you're probably misunderstanding in a way. It actually leaves absolutely everything open, except for the context. It doesn't change anything about the world necessarily (although there are ways, that's another avenue of discussion); it just changes the nature of experiencing the world.

> [Q1: In addition to the above, we differ on our position regarding whether there is a self identify (other than the overall Self) which survives death.]

If "small self" is part of the content of experience - i.e. something which is experienced - then it may or may not continue. All that is certain, is that experiencing will continue.

> [Q1: In your paradigm, it doesn't matter how you live or act.]

Let's pick up on this point specifically. If I do bad, I'll still encounter the repercussions within the content of experience. So how you live corresponds to what you'd like to experience, and the experience of living this way or that way. There is no inherent good or bad other than your interpretation and what it feels like to behave one way or the other.

I would offer:

- Is it better to espouse a fictional and incorrect narrative because it makes people "behave better"? Or is it better to recognise the actual nature of experience?
- And how are ideas of what constitutes "good behaviour" going to be arrived at? Aren't they going to be arbitrary? Actions which are "good" often lead to catastrophic outcomes. Good intentions and theory are not sufficient. Thinking is necessarily incomplete, and actions based upon it must lead to unintended consequences.
- Could it not be the case that the shift in perspective to a true understanding of the nature of experience, might bring about a way of living which does not depend on theoretical notions of what "good living" means, and instead arise from the whole?

[Q1: "The fact remains, all knowledge is a form of ignorance. The most accurate map is still only paper." -- Nisargadatta Maharaj]

Agreed. Although our man here was talking of relative knowledge, rather than direct "being"! ;-)

[...]

I really want to emphasise something here though:

- What we are talking about here, cannot be thought about. We are talking about the "thing before thinking" or "that which thoughts and experience are made of". In order to think about something, we must divide it into parts and then relate those parts in mental space. The problem is, in this case, we are trying to discuss "that which is prior to the division".

You can never create a conceptual framework that captures this. As Peter has pointed out, there are all sorts of different ways to try and capture this fundamental insight, but none of them are right. Their only purpose, in fact, is to point the way to the direct experience. They are right only in the sense of whether they are useful or not. Useful for leading you to the direct knowing of the situation.

That's why there's all this talk of fundamental truth vs relative truth, context vs content, "the absolute", and the "Two Truths". That's why I try to use metaphors, such as the blanket with its folds, or the perceptual space with all possible patterns dissolved within it. These are ways of capturing the essence of it, the key mechanics - but of something which has no essence (essences are "made from it") or mechanics (mechanics are "patterns within it"). The most stripped-down, logically consistent version of the description always reduces itself to a basic paradox: that of something which is non-spatial and non-temporal, also being spatial and temporal - simultaneously, in parallel, but also out of time and without location. To summarise again:

- There is the nature of experience and there is content of experience.
- The nature is always absolutely true and cannot be argued for or against, it is just 100% the case.
- The content is only relatively true and you can argue about that however you want.

And then:

- You can only know the 100% truth by directly realising it in experience, by adopting its shape.
- You cannot think of it, because to think at all is to shift yourself into the shape of the thought.
- However, you can infer it via thought, concluding logically from the shifting nature of content.

Otherwise... It's like arguing and theorising about the texture of an object with someone who refuses to touch it.

> [Q1: And I say to Bernardo, who wants a new ontology, and wants to describe it 'unambiguously,' "ain't gonna' happen."]

The problem I have with it, is that Bernardo seems to want to find The Description and have it accepted, but having it only as a "castle in the sky" which can be argued for in logic. But without connecting a description to its actual experiential meaning, it remains remarkably unpersuasive, because argument isn't really what convinces people. Meanwhile, anyone who looks into this area will find many other descriptions which: a) are more suited to them and, b) are more upfront about being a metaphor that points to something. A practical metaphor, in other words. "Active metaphors."

To keep a castle aloft, you need to demonstrate it to be directly true, otherwise it has no real purpose, other than abstract discussion, in which the majority of people will see no value. Now, the words "spirituality" and "spiritual journey" get bandied about a lot in response to such suggestion. To be honest, I've no idea what those phrases are meant to mean. There's nothing "new age" about directly investigating your own subjective experience (which is all there is) and building out your world description from there. In fact, if you don't do this, your descriptions have no solid foundation and will be meaningless to the majority of people -and therefore a recipe for future tyranny if they become popular with the few.

> [Q1: The mistake you, Bruce, and George keep making is that you talk about the undeniable "experience" but then you draw inferences and conclusions from your alleged experiences which are deniable or at least doubtable to various degrees of certainty. All of your arguments here and your paradigmatic claims are not "undeniable experiences," they are inferences and conclusions you are drawing from your alleged experiences. As with all inferences and deductions, they are subject to various degrees of likelihood or certainty. Why you can't see that is beyond me. However, the failure to see this is common among religious people such as yourself.]

No, no, no. You still misunderstand, even now. Nobody is claiming that "arguments and paradigmatic claims" are undeniable experiences. In fact, the whole point of what I am saying is that such things are just relative content; they are not fundamental. They are just... more dream and they can never be used to get to the bottom of anything. Time and again I've reiterated that nothing can truly be said about the experience - it just is, and the descriptions are merely metaphors to point to that, and its qualities (which are "undivided" and "eternal"). The direct experience cannot be captured in language, as I have repeatedly said, but then you continually argue with the metaphors.

- The experience is certain. (Analogy: the direct experience of touching a hard table.)
- Anything said about it is just content. (Analogy: a theory based on a concept called "hardness".)

I tried to help you by offering several ways of describing it, and also encouraging you to seek the experience yourself, plus I've emphasised the two levels (the nature of experience vs the content of experience) - but you keep ignoring that and arguing with your own misconception of what is being discussed.

You are like a man wearing two glove puppets who, having forgotten they're both being animated by him, thinks that if he keeps watching them they'll reveal the truth about what he is experiencing. But they won't... not until he takes the gloves off - so to speak.

> [Q1: It's false to claim that I don't understand your position just because I disagree with it.]

That would indeed be false. However, you haven't disagreed with my position - you've disagreed with something else! To answer the 100% question, I'll try phrasing it differently:

- I see all conceptual frameworks as relative.
- I don't believe any paradigms are "correct" - as metaphors, they can only be self-consistent and useful.
- I am 100% certain that no paradigm is fundamentally true.

So we might say that experience is always true in terms of being an experience - this includes sensory experiences, and thoughts such as your "paradigms") - but the content of that experience is only true relative to the content of other experiences. This leads to:

- I can directly experience that all experiential content is "made from awareness" and there is no "outside" to this.
- I am 100% certain that the nature of all experience is "awareness" or "mind" (or whatever).

What would you disagree with there?

[...]

Do you just not read before you type? After every post you have skipped over the actual content, and responded in a way which means you are not really following the argument. It's... impolite. Fortunately, I am a very polite person! And you've been kinda fun. ;-)

> [Q1: Once again for about the fourth time, George has refused to answer the question as to whether he is 100% certain of his views.]

I explicitly answered, and will again:

- I am 100% certain that all paradigms represent a relative truth only.
- I am 100% certain of the fundamental truth is that all experience (including thinking about paradigms) is of/within/as "awareness".

Meanwhile, I'm not sure you understand the sense in which Bruce and Peter talk about truth being paradoxical. The sense in which it is paradoxical is that what is true from a relative perspective, is not true from a fundamental perspective, and vice versa - - - but both are true simultaneously. This comes from the sense that: "all matter is made from atoms, but all experiences of 'matter is made from atoms' are made from awareness". (Which means there are no atoms fundamentally.)

> [Q1: You know guys, it's OK to not claim absolute certainty. Doubts in the mind of a finite being trying to contemplate the "ultimate" are a sign of strength not weakness. Hiding from doubt and claiming false 100 certainty is a sign of weakness. Real open minded seekers don't need to claim false certainty. A sign of maturity is acknowledging that we will go to our graves with unanswered questions. And living with those questions and engaging the mystery helps us to grow. Shielding oneself from it by false claims of certainty impedes growth.]

Ha, you've gone into full troll made. I understand that you are probably very attached to seeing yourself as a "seeker". It's a complete waste of time, that, but if it's keeping you busy and out of trouble, then all to the

good. Where you are right, of course, is in claims of false certainty can be problematic. False certainty is the certainty that any conceptual framework - any logical system of thought - can capture "the truth". To perceive directly the nature of things (which of course, must be accessible right now, must be your experience right now, otherwise it wouldn't be the nature of things), you have to give up the seeking. Recognise paradigms as just a bit of fun. Certainty is the feeling of the floor beneath your feet, not thoughts about floors and feet.

You can never think the truth. That is the 100% certainty.

> [Q1: A sign of maturity is acknowledging that we will go to our graves with unanswered questions.]

A sign of maturity is recognising that this means you are looking in the wrong place. That your idea of what form the solution will take is incorrect.

> [Q1: Once again, if someone disagrees with you, you assume that it's because they either didn't understand you or didn't read what you posted. I'll explain below.]

If you don't respond to what I've posted, it's hard to work out whether you read it or understood it...

> [Q1: *'I am 100% certain that all paradigms represent a relative truth only.'*; Does the above statement mean that your views/opinions/etc. expressed here are "relative" and if so, does that mean there is some chance you could be wrong about them, i.e., less than 100% certain?]

I'm saying that no view or opinion is "right" - they are merely self-consistent and useful, or not. I don't believe in the truth of any paradigm. They are narrative fictions to connect observations, nothing more. They are not "true" outside of themselves - hence relative.

> [Q1: *'I am 100% certain of the fundamental truth is that all experience (including thinking about paradigms) is of/within/as "awareness".'*; The above statement tells us very little. And it certainly doesn't answer whether you are 100% certain about the other statements you've made here elsewhere that fall outside of the above two declarations. And therefore, you still haven't answered the question. You've just given some very limited statements and assigned a 100% certainty to them. Maybe your disciples here will be fooled by this, but I'm not. They are limited statements about "paradigms" and "experience is of/within/as awareness." Much of what you assert here is not included within these categories.]

It doesn't tell you anything - it's about an experience, as I've told you multiple times. It's not a matter of belief or, um, "disciples" - it's something anyone can check out for themselves. Nobody should believe anyone else about it. You can't conceptualise it. As I said before, it's the directness of the hardness of the table, rather than thoughts about "hardness".

> [Q1: Is your claim that I am wasting my time as a seeker something you are 100% certain of? Are you declaring a relative or absolute truth when you assert that I'm a seeker wasting my time? This judgmental statement is inconsistent with your Oneness/Monistic paradigm. If everything is One, there's no better or worse path, no waste of time seeking. It doesn't matter what we do in your paradigm -- we all end up part of the undifferentiated consciousness no matter what we do. In fact, we're already there. But I get it, your against making distinctions and judgements until you decide that it's convenient to do so.]

It's completely fine to spend your time seeking - and you'll probably have lots of interesting experiences as a result. But you are wasting your time if you are looking for final answers in searching, if that searching is based on logical thinking. The way in which we are "undifferentiated consciousness" is a the fundamental viewpoint. From the relative viewpoint, there is an apparent here and there. Like the blanket and the folds, the absolute and the relative, as discussed previously...

> [Q1: How can anyone get in "trouble" under your paradigm? There's no better or worse actions, right? Now the true judgmental nature of your religion comes out: I'm a lowly seeker (a derogatory term as you use it), I'm wasting my time, but maybe my useless seeking has some value in keeping me out of trouble. Gee, until you made that indictment, you almost had me convinced you lived as if we were all One. :)]

There are certainly more or less enjoyable experiences, right? The way in which we are all "One" isn't in the sense of us all holding hands dancing in a circle...

> [Q1: *'You can never think the truth. That is the 100% certainty.'*; I would tend to agree with the above.]

If you agree with that, then I'm not exactly sure what you are arguing about.... So, the problem with this discussion is you're not really have a discussion. You are just trying to have me say that I am uncertain about my views. The irony is, I've spent the last few post telling you repeatedly that my view is that "the certainty of views" is meaningless (in terms of ideas about reality). In other words, there is no such thing as a certain view, because views (conceptual frameworks) don't capture the underlying truth; views are connective fictions, prone to change. And the one view I am certain about, isn't a view at all... it's an experience.

[...]

This will be interesting... It's like trying to explain textures to someone who will only accept descriptions that come in the form of colours.

> [Q1: Notice the premise in George's response: we don't have to explain our views to this guy because he doesn't understand us.]

I think it's more like: I already have explained my views to this guy and he doesn't understand me.

Kevin, the difficulty here is that - despite me repeatedly pointing it out to you - you are conflating two things. That is: the conceptual framework (paradigm) and the direct experience. In my previous example of the sensation of touching a hard table surface versus thinking about an idea called "hardness", I tried to indicate the difference. You insist upon discussing "theories of hardness", seemingly under the impression that I am pushing a particular such theory. But I'm doing the opposite: I'm saying that all such theories are fairly arbitrary. Any system of thought is just that: more thoughts. So I don't believe in any paradigm at all. Paradigms are simply useful, or they are not. They are just systems of thought. They're nothing to get too het up about. I have taken pains to point out that no beliefs (thoughts about reality) should be taken to be true. Those thoughts are real experiences (the experience of thinking) but they are not an accurate representation of what thoughts themselves are made of, for instance.

To be clear: you are taking about beliefs/concepts/paradigms/operating systems. I'm talking about what those operating systems would be "made from". Do you not see the difference?

Try right now, to think about what thoughts are made from. What happens? If you get a result - that's another thought. So ask again, what is that thought made from...

We are talking about the thing before paradigms: the direct nature of experiencing. Any description of that, is an interpretation and is just another bunch of concepts. But the thing itself is beyond (or "before") that.

> [Q1: George, instead of humbly admitting that there are parts of your paradigm that you are less than certain about]

What paradigm? Unless you are indicating that the paradigm of "no fundamental paradigm" should include a caveat that maybe there is a fundamental paradigm after all? Again, to be clear: No paradigm is certain because, well, paradigms are just made-up narratives. All that is certain is that you are having experiences (including thoughts about paradigms). I am 100% certain that I am having an experience right now. Are you suggesting that I should have some doubt as to whether I am having an experience or not?

I think you've just given me a clear example of my "textures vs colours" metaphor! ;-)

Your problem is that you don't respond to what anyone writes - instead you want people to discuss their insights within your own framework. Unfortunately, what we are talking about seems to be outside of your framework. I had a read through the discussion, and I don't think you responded to the meat of anyone's post even once. The reason you find comments about direct experience "cryptic" is because you haven't made the effort to understand the point being made. You don't seem to be able to understand that there are aspects to experience that can't be thought about. They are "before" concepts. This is obvious.

For instance, you can see the colours on the screen in front of you. Do you doubt that experience? Do you doubt that you exist and that you are having that experience? This is independent of "paradigms". There are perhaps a thousand different ways to make up a story about "colours" and about "existence" - but none of them affect the fact of the experience of colours and of existence. Do you disagree with that statement?

So, language somewhat forces us to use the word "you" or "I" when talking of the experience of existing, or being. What I am referring to here is the knowing that you exist, without initially drawing any conclusions about what we are. A broader way to phrase these things could be:

- "Colours are happening" (or "being experienced")
- "Existence is happening" (or "being experienced")

So, those are certainties and independent of paradigms (for the purposes of discussion, we're having to turn it into words, but it is "before" language really). We can then go on to exploring the qualities of that experience. For instance, we might go in search of that "I of identity" and see if we can find it (we cannot really; we seem to be 'everywhere') and if the boundaries we assume to exist between areas of experience are actually there (they are not, or at least they do not 'bound'). And from the knowledge that we gain from doing this, we reach certain principles which must be present in any conceptual framework we produce, if it is to be true to how things actually are, rather than just a castle of ideas in the sky. And the knowledge gained from these observations does indeed suggest views one would take about consciousness, identity, death, and so on. However, the answers often takes the form of pointing out that the basis for the question is incorrect, because it comes from a false assumption - false assumptions which can only be revealed by examining one's direct experience, and not by just thinking about things.

To continue... You realise that, if you come up with a "paradigm" that talks about identities surviving death, reincarnation, karma and so on, but which does not connect to direct experience, then it's just a bunch of thoughts pointing at each other, right? Just a made-up story? And it won't matter how self-consistent that story is, because if it doesn't connect to actual experience, then it's not actually saying anything beyond itself.

In other words, if you have a preferred "paradigm", and you cannot tell me how it connects to your direct experience, then it's just made-up story-time, a collection of unexamined concepts and beliefs. That's religion.

That isn't a very challenging concept: make observations, create connective descriptions from them. You seem to want to skip out the observations part, which is actually the part that prevents things being a religion...

> [Q1: I clearly meant to draw people out in this thread and challenge their views, not push them over the edge.]

The problem here, Kevin, is that you haven't challenged people's views, because you haven't accepted the presentation of those views on their own terms. The whole idea of going into an exchange with the idea of "challenging" - rather than "discussing" or "exploring" - is flawed in this case. How can you kick off a "challenge", when you don't actually know what you are challenging? Your responses show that... you can't.

Of all the possible topics for a discussion, this are is the least appropriate for conversations which take the form of aggressive argument with a view to "winning". Within a couple of exchanges, you end up in a stagnant position, because a lot of time when we are discussing this area, we are agreeing on terms, before the actual meat of the discussion begins. Failing to realise this, is why this thread has got nowhere - and why people don't feel particularly interested in engaging anymore. Their thinking is: why waste time trying to show the guy that he's missing the point, preventing the discussion, when he won't listen?

[...]

It's about how we're all blindly attached to a particular paradigm and have started a religion based upon it - all must submit! Apparently.

First off - shall we adjust to a more civil, less high-handed tone? Thanks.

To continue: We should be aware of where direct knowledge stops, and the extended concepts begin. There's nothing at all wrong with creating a logical conceptual framework seeded from a few observations (that's exactly what we do) - what matters is that we know we are doing this, and that we are aware of the boundary between experience and thoughts about experience.

There's no particular paradigm that is "right" - there are only relatively useful paradigms. One should not believe conceptual frameworks, one should use them. And it's the usefulness that would be the key "measuring rod", I suggest. What is the purpose of this paradigm? How well does it fulfil that purpose? How can it be tested? Of course, one purpose might simply be "to feel better about life", for those so inclined...

A few insights we gain from attending to our direct experience, to begin with:

- Our direct experience corresponds to something like an open, undivided, unbounded "awareness".
- The content of our experiences are formed from, and arise within, that "awareness".
- The "awareness" persists even as all content changes.

- There is no particular localised "I" that can be found. Occasionally one might identify a particular sensation with "me"; occasionally one might identify a particular thought as "me", but these come and go and appear within that "awareness".
- All thoughts about an "external" world also arise as experiences within this space.
- When we fall asleep, this strand of content fades out, and is replaced by another stand of content; "awareness" remains present as the context throughout.

The point here is to attend to the context as well as the content, and so incorporate that properly into our descriptions. From here we might reconsider our identities, our relationship with "the world", what "the world" is and where it is, and also consider what is meaningful to talk about, and what is not and must be left open. None of which we might have done, if we had simply argued content and concept.

> [Q1: I have been hammering this point for some time and am pleasantly surprised you now acknowledge it.]

Kevin, what you have been hammering on about has mostly been independent of what anyone has been writing, and often independent of what you have previously been writing. Let's not congratulate ourselves for shooting bullets in the air, eh?

> [Q1: Those deductions and conclusions necessarily have less certainty than the experience itself.]

So, I believe your actual point you were pushing previously was: how one could be 100% certain about a paradigm, specifically how could I be certain of my own. I repeatedly replied that one could not be 100% certain about a paradigm - although one might be 100% that it was not fundamentally true. One could only be 100% about direct experience, and that this was fundamentally true. I have been hammering this point for some time and am pleasantly surprised you now acknowledge it.

> [Q1: What I don't understand is why you won't disclose the deductions and conclusions you've made about life after death, reincarnation, etc.]

The "what I don't understand" rhetorical device is a very tired one. It is better to be more direct. What I don't understand is why you don't ever respond to the meat of a comment, but instead cherry pick sentences in a wearying manner, and attempt to present them as some development in your own position. Particularly egregious is your misrepresentation of others' comments. Generally the procedure is: you recognise the comments, reflect your understanding of them, then ask the questions which follow. You are not in a university debating club, pretending to be in parliament... (hopefully) There is nothing to be gained by "winning" on a technicality. All you are winning, is continued ignorance.

> [Q1: Is it that you refrain from having any opinion on these matters [life after death, karma, reincarnation] or simply that you don't want to reveal them?]

I mostly definitely refrain from having a final opinion on those in terms of expanded detail because, as we have now agreed, once we stray from direct knowledge, we lose certainty, and there is much cultural baggage involved in those terms. However, starting with our earlier points:

- Consciousness - in the sense of "awareness" rather than personal consciousness - doesn't begin or end; it is independent of content.

- Content is always evolving, changing - there will always be more content, therefore experiencing never ends.
- Content is apparently continuous, in the sense that there is progression rather than discontinuity.

Which gives us:

- There is continuity of awareness, but since it isn't continuity of a personal type, this does not necessarily correspond to what we would typically call "life after death".
- When the content associated with this personal experience ends, more content may arise subsequently, but that is not a personal "reincarnation".
- The lack of discontinuity suggests an accumulation of patterns, which means that the content of experience now becomes the foundation for the content of experience later. This might be interpreted as a version of the concept of "karma".

So, the answers are "yes but no": There is life after death in the sense that consciousness never ends; there is reincarnation in the sense that content of some sort continues; there is karma in the sense that experiences become the foundation for subsequent experiences. However, none of these necessarily operate on a personal, human basis, and so the comfort traditionally derived from those ideas might not be available here.

> [Q1: George, I think we both agree that "experience" is the best standard or "measuring rod" upon which to base a spiritual paradigm or religious belief.]

Before we proceed, I think we have to address a previous point that we've left dangling: purpose. That is, if the purpose of a paradigm is to be useful (because we've concluded, rightly, that it cannot be certain or accurate, only self-consistent and perhaps applicable) - why would we want to construct a "spiritual paradigm"? What is a "spiritual paradigm" useful for? Why bother?

And if we construct one, why would we need to "believe" it? Surely, having recognised that nature of experiencing from our direct investigations, and having recognised that content is relative and conceptual frameworks are coherent rather than fundamentally true, we wouldn't "believe" in them at all. They would just be "ways of thinking"?

I don't think I would call experiencing a "measuring rod"; it simply is. It can't really be compared to; it just is itself.

> [Q1: What I'm unclear on is what measuring rods/methodology are you relying upon to reach the above tentative conclusions?]

I'm not - because I'm not reaching those conclusions really. Rather, I offered a tentative idea about how someone who was keen to look for evidence of concepts such as "karma", "reincarnation" and "life after death" might try to map those ideas onto the properties of direct experiencing.

Personally, I think that would mean working in reverse and it's not advisable; it probably misrepresents both the experience and the concepts. If you were, in our modern culture, to being with the observations, it is unlikely that you would be lead to those concepts, as commonly used. In fact, one might imagine that those concepts are a bastardisation of early attempts to describe those direct observations in language, in an attempt to point the way to those who had not yet attended to the direct experience.

> [Q1: First, we construct spiritual paradigms because have a desire for answers about life after death, the nature of the self/soul, whether reincarnation and karma are true, etc.]

Surely the correct starting point is not a search for a paradigm. It is a search for the truth of the nature of our experience. If we begin with questions based on the "life after death", "souls", "reincarnation", "karma" - then we have already begged the question. Such concepts come with historical and cultural baggage, perhaps. Their original meaning may even be lost to us. They already belong to or imply a paradigm. This maybe a case of: those questions do not make sense. We can't presume these concepts are meaningful beyond their self-referential framework.

> [Q1: Another reason why we should bother to construct a spiritual paradigm is because it gives us meaning, context, and a basis to act -- even if action is merely introspection or focus on the "experience."]

There may be other ways to arrive at meaning, other than paradigms, or beliefs. In fact, you can't say in advance that a "spiritual paradigm" will give you any of those things.

> [Q1: This New Age argument to the effect that there is nothing to do, you just have to "awaken" kills me because "awakening" is something to do -- the state of awakening, enlightenment, or awareness of _____ , is something to be attained.]

This might be a misunderstanding of the point being made, though, through a lack of understanding as to the nature of "enlightenment". For instance, if enlightenment is a noticing of what you are then there is nothing you can do about it, and it is not a state to be attained - because both of those ideas imply a separation and a causal relationship that does not exist.

> [Q1: If you look at a paradigm as being a model or map of "reality," it helps us to chart a course. Is the value of a spiritual paradigm really being argued against? . . . It helps us to accomplish goals, test hypothesis, understanding our place in the cosmos, etc.]

If we cannot say what it is for, the yes. It is not certain that a "spiritual paradigm" (something we have yet to properly define), would help us accomplish goals or chart a course, necessarily. That would depend on the form of that paradigm, and we cannot tell what that would be in advance, surely. Without begging the question.

> [Q1: But paradigms are inescapable and so there isn't really a choice between living with and without a paradigm. The so called "no paradigm" view is just another paradigm.]

This is not necessarily true. This assumes that everything can be captured in thought, and that thinking is inescapable, and that it is necessary for understanding (or that all understanding falls within it). You seem to be presuming that all experience is lived "through" a paradigm. Have you ever experienced such a thing happening?

> [Q1: No computer works without some type of operating system.]

The world is not a computer, just as people are not thinking machines.

> [Q1: "Experience" by itself is not a measuring rod BUT when you are relying upon it to make deductions, inferences, and conclusions, you are using "experience" as a measuring rod.]

I think we have to be more careful about the point at which we cross the boundary between "direct experience", and the direct experience of concepts "about" direct experience. It is not clear at all that direct experience can be a measuring rod, since it is not contained within concepts; concepts are contained with it. As soon as we begin to make a theory about "the hardness of surfaces", we are in the realm of thinking. This is fine for quantifying theories for scientific endeavours, but in this particular case we are talking about a "spiritual paradigm", which seems to be more about "answering questions about the nature of life". It is not even certain that such question are meaningful can be answered conceptually.

> [Q1: I disagree. You are clearly offering an opinion as to life after death, reincarnation, and karma, albeit a provisional opinion. That fact that you aren't claiming 100% certainty as to your views doesn't change the analysis.]

Actually, I presented a way that you might map observed certainties to your concepts, out of courtesy. I'm claiming nothing about them, because I wouldn't use those terms. To me, they are "not even wrong".

So, the difficulty here is that you are already presuming an outcome. You are looking for a paradigm, seeking the answer to certain questions which in themselves already assume a certain type of structure to the world, and a certain form that the any insights should take. You've not only pre-structured the form of the answers, you've pre-structured an entire framework.

(You are also focused on issues belief, certainty and others which, really, are just taken for granted normally in any metaphysical exploration.)

To really get anywhere, I'd say you need to wind back a bit, to a more open form of question. Something like:

- What is the nature of experience?
- What are the implications of that nature?

Your current questions are already too far down the line and you haven't properly defined them:

- "Is there life after death?"
- "is there reincarnation?"
- "Is there a soul?"
- "Is there karma?"

All of these imply a certain worldview and are meaningless outside of this worldview when we ask what, exactly, is the question. And I'd suggest that the clarifications would come down to a requirement to define what we mean by "I". So I'll ask the question:

- What are you?

And so it continues...

> [Q1: The goal of a scientific paradigm such as electromagnetism or fusion isn't to have such a paradigm but rather to harness electricity or create a fusion reactor.]

A scientific model's 'purpose' is to provide a connective framework to link observations. Practical things may then come from that. A common thing in science is to ask a question, and then discover that there was an assumption within the structure of the question which means it was not appropriate in the format asked. (e.g. "What is the radius of the sun's orbit around the Earth?").

> [Q1: I certainly agree that we shouldn't set out with preconceived conclusions but unless you're going to argue that life after death, reincarnation, and karma, are not legitimate issues. . . . If you didn't think they were legitimate issues, why did you offer opinions about them?]

I offerred a possible way for you to think about them, in reconfigured from; it was not an opinion. In fact, my suggestions should have indicated to you that the form of your question, like our radius-seeking scientist above, may be inappropriate.

> [Q1: In order to avoid conceding that there is something spiritual to be attained you suggest that (1) enlightenment is the goal and (2) we obtain it by noticing what "you" are. If that's the case then "noticing what you are" is what needs to be done. "Noticing what you are" is the goal to be attained. I realize this conflicts with the "spiritually correct" position we're all supposed to take on this issue which is that there is nothing to do and nothing to attain. Today, you're not considered spiritually advanced unless you parrot this Yoda line. :)]

The reason this language comes up repeatedly is that, it's fairly accurate - albeit apparently somewhat unhelpful. You can't really argue with it, and it seems almost meaningless, because it's pointing to an insight which can't really be explored logically, since it doesn't logically follow from anything. The reason that all those Zen and nondualist texts, for instance, are filled with metaphors and parables, is because you can't think your way through to the insight, there is no path as such, no steps you can take. It has to happen all at once; it's a transformation. That's what insight is. There's nothing you can do in the world or in thought for this.

Here's my metaphor - Imagine there is a blanket of material. The only property of that blanket is "awareness". Not awareness of anything, just "awareness". The blanket simply is. Now, we introduce folds into the blanket. The blanket is now aware of "being" something, of being a particular shape, of having an experience. The folds are the content of the experience, the blanket is the nature of the experience.

So the insight of enlightenment is the direct recognition that the nature of experience is folds-in-a-blanket, and that you are the folds and the blanket. Since this is always true, you never become it, you simply realise that this is the case. However, there's no act in the world or thought you can have to give you this realisation, because those are simply "rearrangements of the folds". You have to simply become the understanding with no logical step leading up to it. It's a leap of faith, without a leap.

> [Q1: The fact that someone is looking for a paradigm doesn't mean that they are "presuming an outcome." Would you claim that a scientist such as Einstein was presuming an outcome simply because he was in search of a paradigm about physics?]

The full paragraph you are responding to here referred to "seeking the answer to certain questions which themselves already assume a certain type of structure to the world". That is today's theme, you will notice. That you are asking the wrong questions, because you already have a preference for certain types of answers.

> [Q1: You're assuming I need to wind back. Again, maybe I've moved beyond "the nature of the experience." Maybe you're the one making the assumption that "that" is the end all be all. Your general assumption -- dare I say paradigm -- throughout all of this thread is that the "answer" is simply to focus on the nature of the experience. The irony is that you have been railing against paradigms while at the same time wielding your own.]

How can you move beyond the nature of experience? That's like saying that you are moving beyond language... Which perhaps leads us to an important point: you seem to be confusing the use of language at all, with promoting a "paradigm".

So... This conversation isn't really working, because it has no foundation. It lacks either of the two things which might make it worthwhile:

- You lay out your own thinking in order to kick off an exploration of that area and see where it goes.
- You point out a specific issue in a line of thought, with the goal of resolving it.

Instead, you began this thread with the intention of broadly "challenging" people's worldviews (or "paradigms"), without really knowing what those people have actually been discussing, what their thinking is. At the same time, you seem to have a particular view of your own, which you won't outline but are obviously very defensive of. You seem to be trying to lead people around to that view "covertly", rather than openly discussing it. As a result, you're going round in circles, because rather than entering into a full discussion, responding to points thoughtful and constructively, you are trying to shepherd the conversation towards a predetermined outcome. This makes discussion pointless, of course. Particularly since it assumes you have a particular fundamental insight to share which - judging from your "yoda" response above - seems unlikely.

If you'd like to simply lay out your views, I'd still be interested in hearing them. Alternatively, if you'd like to pick a couple of points and really explore them properly, in an exchange rather than as a broadcast, that would be okay too. As it stands, this seems to be about you wanting to "win" a discussion. Which means it is not a discussion, it's an argument. And not even that - because I'm not arguing...

> [Q1: Once you realize that you cannot get enough data or answers by relying on experience alone, in order to make spiritual "progress," a working spiritual paradigm is helpful. Why that obvious conclusion is being debated here is beyond me.]

So, you are suggesting that when you can't get answers from experience, rather than considering whether your questions are nonsensical, you should just... make shit up? Because I don't see how you get a "working spiritual paradigm" by doing so. In what sense does it "work"? What is it for, if it is detached from experience? It is simply... fantasy. But perhaps that is the aim. If your goal is to construct a worldview which simply makes you feel better, then of course that is fine. But there's not much point in discussing it here.

> [Q1: In your above statement, you assert that "the insight of enlightenment is the direct recognition that the nature of experience is folds-in-a-blanket." How can you claim for certain that you know what enlightenment is unless you claim to be enlightened?]

Well, "enlightened" is a pretty poor word for it; I think it gives the wrong impression. It's better probably to call it "realisation" maybe? Who knows. Who indeed! (Little joke.)

So, you seem to think that all of this stuff is a Big Deal. You're obviously really into "spirituality" and seeking and all that kind of thing. You're looking for a way of understanding it all in words and "paradigms" (you really like those, I can tell). The very fact that you talk about their being a paradigm of enlightenment demonstrates your confusion, though. Really, it's not like that, You're wasting your time if that's the approach you are taking. You'll spend you're whole life just dreaming, making dream-discovery and dream-discovery, without ever noticing the fact of dreaming. The reason you might find what people are saying frustrating or empty, is because it is empty of content. The point is that you notice the nature of content. So "enlightenment" makes no promises as regards any of the questions you posing, in the way that you are posing them, in human terms. Hence all my chastisements over the last few posts. All of the stuff you are talking about, it's content. Relative truth. What "enlightenment" concerns, is the nature of content. It comes "before" the content of experiences, and "before" thoughts about experiences. There is no "paradigm" involved, because paradigms are made from it, not the other way around. Think of it this way, perhaps:

The Shape-shifter

If you were a shape-shifter, how would you describe the process of shape-shifting? You would just "become" the new shape; it's all you, so there's no one part causing the other part. Continuing with this: how would you work out you were a shape-shifter? The only way would be... to shift your shape. There would be no evidence of you being a shape-shifter between shiftings.

But once you realised that's what you were, then it would completely re-contextualise your identity - but nothing about the shapes themselves would have done this. You could waste your whole life examining the shapes of one state, and never come to the understanding. You would just have to shift yourself, for no reason at all, and using no technique.

Okay...

What you should to, is stop thinking or typing for a while, and read over this conversation we've had. It's all there, plain as day, in front of you. And... it's kinda boring. That's what it's like. Although it's also very nice, the change of context.

"Spirituality" as generally practiced does not, I think, have a whole lot to do with coming to realise the nature of experience, and therefore the world and the self. It might be a lucky byproduct, but that's all. You just end up swapping one metaphor for another, on and on. Heading off on exciting pretend adventures. That's fine as far as it goes, but if you're expecting that to give you The Answers, you've made a mistake: all you'll ever get, is more experiences...

Certainly, though, there's no point in us talking any further, because for one reason or another, you genuinely do not seem to comprehend what is said to you.

This may be due to not really contemplating what is written before responding, and so genuinely not understanding what is being said, not even understanding you are missing the point. It may be that you are very attached to the form you wish "spirituality" or "enlightenment" to take, and so you skim over things that do not fit that, since you deem them not to be "answers". It may even be out of fear because, intuitively, you realise that if you ever do commit to this it will destroy whatever you're holding onto (and it will). Or perhaps you are genuinely a very arrogant person, who thinks they have lessons to gift the forums they come across, and seek to illuminate the ignorant as a special form of public service. Or maybe you're just a bit of a troll.

Regardless, there is no benefit for you in continuing here, I'd say. And there certainly isn't any for me (considering I only do it for fun).

Aside - Seriously, do some reading. Actually contemplate the metaphors and little thought experiments further up the post. Trying to find answers via paradigm-construction is a fool's errand. Paradigms are for description, not discovery. **Why not just "skip to the end"?**

[...]

But on the other hand, what good does it do to perpetuate further wanderings in the "conceptual forest", when you might save someone a lot of time by persistently pointing out they can look up at the sky, and then from there look down at the forest, at any time?

> [Q2: The point about owning up to enlightenment is a good one though.]

Agreed. Really though, I think the word shouldn't be used at all, except in a historical context, because it's become so mangled as a concept. Who really knows what anyone means when they ask about "enlightenment" nowadays? It's become entangled with certain stories and aspirations; it has become literally "idealised". Better to put it aside so as not to invoke all those accumulated connotations, and instead speak more directly of the nature of experience, or whatever you might want to call it. Sticking to those old words and heading out on a journey of specialness, I think it places a weight of expectation on things, a need for an event or an experience - for dramatic content - and that leads us astray.

> [Q2: I think Kevin has not got the hang of the difference between conventional and ultimate truth. Both are important. Paradigms and theories, as conventional truths, can be more or less useful but are never the end of the story.]

I mean, it completely reasonable, because our first step is naturally to want to "work things out". But eventually we must pause and wonder, "What is 'working things out' made from?", and then notice that what we are after will never be found within the unending granularity of description.

> [Q2: But generally I'm still unsure what the complaint is here. Underneath all the words the principle question seems to be, 'How can you be so sure? Is that it?]

That's what it comes down to, it seems to me. In essence: "How can you be so sure that my spiritual seeking won't one day turn out to be a good idea and I'll have been right all along?"

It's essentially an eternal "yes, but what if?". By trying to recast everything as a "paradigm", Kevin's challenge takes the form of: "Yes but how can you be sure you are really seeing the colour red?" - which is surely to confuse someone using a word to point to something, with them suggesting the word (and the language framework it is embedded in) is the something. The story of "red" is a relative fiction; the experience of red simply "is". And so on, and on...

I suppose it depends on the audience, but "enlightenment" seems to come with a lot of baggage about behaviour and outlook, and ideas about having a particular experience, beyond simply the fact of perceiving. I guess discussing that can be part of the unpacking process. Paradigms aren't an issue, unless you insist that everything is part of a paradigm, and therefore relative - which is to say, to claim there is no fundamental truth, only conceptual truth, and so argue that "seeing red? that's just your opinion man!". Because that

means, as a "spiritual seeker", you can never reach your destination, because you're on a mission to fine "the ideal thought".

> [Q2: Trouble is that the literature is endless and I gave up in the end.]

True. And similar. I mean, there are only so many ways to say the same thing, and if it's pointing to something which is meant to be experienced for oneself, rather than being a "paradigm", then eventually you get metaphor exhaustion. :-)

... Some particular favourites:

> "Later, the term [enlightenment] was applied more narrowly to a specific aspect of the awakened condition - that aspect of this experience that was considered to be unchanging, that is, an element which is not the product of either mental constructions in particular, or of causes and conditions in general."
>
> "I recognized only that my eyes are placed crosswise above the nose that stands lengthwise, and that I was not deceived by others. I came home from China with nothing in my hand. There is nothing mysterious in Buddhism. Time passes as it is natural, the sun rising in the east, and the moon setting into the west."
>
> "The entire problem is that what the seeker seeks is what he already is, what he always has been, what he could not possibly otherwise BE. To apperceive this profoundly is to awaken to what is known as 'enlightenment'.

[...]

Well, what are feathers for anyway, if not to be ruffled? Online pretty much doesn't work for these conversations and I'd sworn off them, but... on holiday, beer and iPad in hand, feeling a bit argumentative, I couldn't resist.

"However you imagine that it works, That's how it works". -- The Law of Metaphor

Afterword [by davindragul]

“Just don't care”

"Just don't care" has been my mantra of late, and I think it's definitely the first step on the way to realising a lot of the ideas espoused on this sub.

If you have a casual indifference to everything not directly related to the improvement of yourself as a person, you can't help but succeed in life, in the way *you* want to succeed. If you don't care, in an uncompromising and true manner, there is nothing worth worrying about. **If the world is bendable to your will, why put thoughts into anything negative?**

Appendix: WeirdWay, A Selection [by Various]

weird (adj.)

c. 1400,

• **"having power to control fate"**, from *wierd* (n.), from Old English *wyrd* "fate, chance, fortune; destiny; the Fates," literally **"that which comes,"**

• from Proto-Germanic *wurthiz* (cognates: Old Saxon *wurd*, Old High German *wurt* "fate," Old Norse *urðr* **"fate, one of the three Norns"**),

• from PIE *wert-* **"to turn, to wind,"** (cognates: German *werden*, Old English *weorðan* **"to become"**),

• from root *wer-* (3) **"to turn, bend"** (see *versus*).

• For sense development **from "turning" to "becoming,"** compare phrase turn into "become."

Utthana - Consciousness as an Extended Capacity

Physicalism is the philosophical perspective that everything which exists is either physical or reducible to the physical. The physicalist therefore naturally contends that the "ontological primitives", or fundamental constituents of all of reality, are a handful of subatomic particles. The physicalist's worldview, when boiled down to its most straightforward form, is that every phenomenon in nature can be, and has been, constructed from the dynamics of these particles and the peculiar, quantum laws which they obey. While physicalism is a fashionable and popular philosophical position today, it is not free of critique. The most notorious and difficult of these critiques of the physicalist's model is the famous "hard problem of consciousness". The consciousness problem goes as follows: these subatomic, quantum primitives are apparently not conscious and the emergence of consciousness from an interplay of inert, non-conscious "stuff" is inexplicable. Physicalists have had a hard time reconciling this, and have largely ignored the problem and continued to reduce consciousness to the physical.

The most popular form of physicalism, for example, is of a reductionist variety: reducing the experiential nature of the world to the functions of the physical brain. Reducing experience to the functioning of an organ, adding this intermediary between the experienced world and the experiencer, may seem natural and intuitive to those familiar with neuroscience, but is actually rather problematic. Granting that it would be possible for conscious experience to emerge from the purely non-conscious matter of the brain (which remains inexplicable) the worldview that results from this understanding is bizarrely self-defeating. There is almost no difference, in this brain-consciousness model of physicalism, between dreams, hallucinations, and waking life. The latter is apparently the result of electromagnetic stimulation arriving to your brain from an external world (although we never have direct access to this world) whereas the former two are a sort of masturbatory self-stimulation of the brain without this external input. In the case of all three, our experience of the world is, in fact, an experience of our brains and only our brains – and never an experience of the world itself. In other words, at best, we can experience an imperfect copy of reality, filtered by a lens which cuts out more than it allows through. We are sitting in the electro-chemical movie theater of our skulls and played a film which, apparently, gives us a glimpse into an inaccessible world beyond the theater.

What reason do we have to believe that the film is providing us with a comprehensive worldview? Or even a particularly accurate one? Or, given the theory of evolution, one which is not merely adapted to our particular biological needs but genuinely representative of objective reality? We have none. The brain-physicalist's world beyond the theater of our skulls is odorless, tasteless, and colorless, mathematical and electromagnetic, lacking nearly all of the traits we associate with the world that we experience. The physicalist here has stretched to create, in essence, two separate realities: the one which corresponds to all of our experiences, and the one which, despite its inaccessibility to us, is "out there", underlying the reality we experience despite being derived and understood entirely through the lens of the film. And, of course, given our experience with dreams and hallucinations, can we ever know that the waking life we experience is not merely some Matrix-esque simulation? To test a copy, one needs access to the original, and we have no such access and are, in fact, forever shut off from it. The internal reality of our experiences, inescapable and imperfect, is the only source of information we have about the inaccessible external reality, and is the source of all of our theories about the external reality's existence at all. In other words, if brain-physicalism is correct, it casts doubt on itself; it is metaphysics deduced exclusively through a kaleidoscope.

Those physicalists who avoid this approach may, and sometimes do, go so far as to simply avoid the issue by denying the existence of consciousness at all. Galen Strawson describes this denial as, "the strangest thing that has ever happened in the whole history of human thought, not just the whole history of philosophy." Strawson's approach is one of the relatively few alternatives to reduction or denial and his theory claims to circumvent the problem of consciousness' emergence while nevertheless maintaining a variant of physicalism. He does this by defending a philosophy called panpsychism, which argues that all matter is conscious, or "experiential", although the intensity or quality of that experientiality will correspond with the complexity and arrangement of the matter. It borders on a modern retelling of animism, but it does resolve the issue of the emergence of consciousness: it can now be deduced from its constituent physical components as all physical matter is simultaneously experiential. The panpsychist wishes to note that emergence, in this sense, is no longer exceptional. One example might be the existence of the property of liquidity, which emerges only when a sufficient number of hydrogen and oxygen atoms are arranged just so. In this case, none of the individual atoms can be said to possess the property of liquidity, and yet in sufficient combination, this property seems to arrive from an ontological nowhere. In the case of liquidity, or countless others, however, we do not find this apparent emergence to be philosophically unsupportable. We can understand a higher-level property such as liquidity as being ultimately deducible from the lower-level properties of the constituent substances. In other words, we can conceive of a computer program which could simulate liquidity given nothing but a full knowledge of the laws of physics and the nature of hydrogen and oxygen atoms. We can conceive of some property of "proto-liquidity" possessed by the atoms, some logical attribute which allows liquidity to explicably emerge. Just so, argues Strawson, with consciousness.

The question becomes, however, can we really conceive of subatomic particles possessing a "proto-consciousness"? Is it equally conceivable to imagine the emergence of conscious experience (e.g. red-ness or sweet-ness) from any properties of inert, physical material no matter how dynamic and complex? We have not the slightest reason to think that the inanimate physical particles of a rock or a table each possess an individual potential for consciousness, and that further each group or division of such particles possess a collective potential for consciousness. With no clear delineation, are we left to believe that at some very basic level, the constituents of self-awareness reside in rocks and tables? The merit of panpsychism may be merely that it at least allows for physicalism to work, but even there, it is only semantically a physicalist philosophy at all. Panpsychism is a capitulation of physicalism rather than its preservation, as the panpsychist by definition defers that consciousness is foundational.

If we are not to accept brain-consciousness, consciousness denial, or panpsychism, where do we turn? Can physicalism be preserved at all? A final nail in the coffin may well be the problem of Boltzmann Brains. Even if physicalism is true, despite our inability to identify a consistent explanation of our observable reality in physicalist terms, physicalism itself predicts its own utter unlikelihood. Physics predicts that it is far more parsimonious, more likely, more Occam-friendly, and least extravagant to assume that only a free-floating brain exists and nothing else. In other words, because brains can produce waking-quality experience during dreaming, which apparently doesn't require external-to-brain matter, it makes sense that for a statistical distribution of possibilities of matter arrangements, for every brain-in-addition-to-a-universe matter arrangement there must be countless brain-in-a-thermodynamic-soup arrangements according to nothing more than the foundational laws of thermodynamics. While the laws of physics, of course, do not explicitly rule out the possibility of a universe in which both brains and external physical objects exist, they propose that it is exceedingly unlikely that your specific brain is one that's surrounded by matter which exists in parallel to

all of the subjective experiences you're having (as opposed to the vastly more likely possibility of your brain hanging in the void of space, essentially dreaming).

So, rather than specifically strive to preserve physicalism, let's instead get to the heart of the matter. We must, as in any good philosophy, first do away with our presumptions and cut straight to the empirical reality of what we actually know. Immediately, the critical philosopher will discover that it is impossible to possess any information about reality which is not experiential and perspectival. This is the antithesis of the consciousness denial argument, the Cartesian fundamental. We know, first and primarily, that our consciousness exists. From here, rather than searching for an explanation for the emergence of consciousness in the world, we are, in fact, searching for an explanation of the world within our consciousness, for our conscious experience and perspective is already a given – and it is the only given, the only absolute certainty. Therefore before we attempt to define the world that exists outside, or external, to our conscious experience, we have to first establish that such a world exists at all.

We can begin by examining the logical conceivability of an external, objective reality apart from our consciousness. Can we conceive of, say, a chair, objectively? We will find that we can only envision a chair from a perspective or an angle. We can only understand its appearance in terms of shape, color, or dimension. We can only base our conception of a chair off of those things which we have seen. No matter how many of these tools we apply in unison, our comprehension of a chair, or any other object, is merely an amalgam of subjective, perspectival, potential experiences of it. Unfathomable in every way is the chair as such, objectively. We cannot imagine anything, no matter how basic, existing without perspective. In the spirit of Kant, a perspectival appearance seems to be the condition for our understanding of anything at all. Therefore experientiality, or perspectivity, is fundamental to the entirety of reality as we know it. Nothing can even be conceived of apart from it. Knowing this, we will not, as the brain-physicalist does, proceed to invent an objective, external world on the basis of absolutely no empirical evidence whatsoever. And we will not, as the panpsychist does, make this experientiality a property of some objective matter. Instead, we will simply conclude that consciousness is fundamental to reality in and by itself, independent of matter. We can be certain that consciousness is a necessary prerequisite for the entirety of empirical reality.

Adopting this position circumvents the hard problem of consciousness, of course, as that issue only arises when attempting to fit consciousness into a physical world, which we are not attempting to do at all. But this new position does not, immediately, explain the apparently close relationship between the brain and consciousness. If consciousness underlies all of reality, a prerequisite to anything conceivable, why are only beings with certain biologies conscious? In fact, why is consciousness "tied down" to anything at all? And a more basic question we must ask is, if consciousness underlies all of reality, what does that mean for our metaphysics? In what way does something, or anything, underlie reality itself? These questions will be addressed in reverse order, from broadest to narrowest.

If we conclude that consciousness is a prerequisite of reality, where does this land consciousness metaphysically? From this new perspective, consciousness is filling a role quite comparable to the role filled by space-time in the traditional physicalist approach. Just as spacetime is a "something" which underlies all of the physical world, the capacity which allows for the existence of the material objects which constitute the physicalist's entire reality, from our new perspective, consciousness fills this role as the bedrock of reality. It serves as an underlying capacity, intangible in and of itself, which allows for the arising of the basic

constituents of the world: perspectives and experiences. We can imagine the "fabric of consciousness" in much the same way that we can imagine the "fabric of spacetime": the vital facility of reality.

This comparison deserves some clarification. The adopter of this consciousness-capacity theory may very well experience the same apparently-physical world that any physicalist does. She encounters objects that seem to be in space, physical laws, and a universe which seems external to her. The experience of an extended space-time enters into her worldview as much as the physicalist's. The crucial difference is that she sees space-time as a manifestation, not as fundamental. Fully aware that she can conceive of nothing which is not experiential and perspectival, she understands space-time and the physical objects within it as the comprehensible manifestation of the world, not the bedrock of actuality itself (which is her own consciousness). Unlike the brain-physicalist, she has no need to fear that she is getting a distorted or unreliable view, missing out on some objective "real" world, because perspectivity and experientiality are inherent features of her reality. She has no delusions of encountering a world which is free of either.

What of brains and their peculiar association with consciousness, then? If we imagine space-time as the perspectival manifestation of the "fabric of consciousness", consciousness permeates the entirety of space-time (as opposed to being attached as a proto-property to specific instances of physical materials within it). In fact, space-time is itself a manifestation of conscious capacity, the perspectival and experiential facility of reality. Brains, therefore, don't originate consciousness at all. Not dissimilar to panpsychism, consciousness as a capacity is present with or without brains – but unlike panpsychism, it does not arise as a property of the physical constituents of brains. Brains, instead, are physical manifestations of subjective conscious states...

This depiction pushes hard against our instincts. We are not used to thinking of consciousness as a field, as extended, or as present in the physical world – but, again, the physical world as we know it is inherently a conscious experience, inescapably perspectival and experiential. Consciousness' specific association with brains can be thought of as a matter of its fluctuations and concentrations, not dissimilar to the "warps" of space-time. Brain states, then, not unlike the oscillations in a radio's circuitry: these aren't producing the radio waves, but rather corresponding to their reception of them. In the model of consciousness as an underlying capacity, just as in the physicalist model of space-time as an underlying capacity, consciousness is fundamental to reality but does not necessarily exist uniformly. Brains are a reflection of this, peculiarities of consciousness' concentration or localization.

At this point, the physicalist-minded reader may have been pushed to the boundaries of what they are willing to accept. This metaphysics of consciousness as an extended field, as the underlying nature of what we perceive as space-time, is alien to the physicalist worldview. Besides philosophizing, do we have any evidence to support such a metaphysics? Is this mere theory? I would argue that the evidence is itself the existence of consciousness at all, undeniable as it is, unexplainable with any physical theories. But let's ask of it the questions we ask of any theory: does it offer testable hypotheses? Does it make any predictions which are distinct from those predictions made by conventional physicalism? By and large, it makes two predictions which are unique: first, it predicts the potential for a subtle, shared, collective unconscious, since the "concentrations" of individual, subjective consciousnesses are fluctuations on a broader field, and second, it predicts the potential for individuals to have experiences which could go beyond the constraints of a body's limited sensory and neurological faculties if the mechanism for consciousness' concentration were sufficiently disrupted (in other words, if the subjective experience could "delocalize" or "expand" out of sync with the brain state then the brain state could not be producing, but only locally channeling, the subjective

experience). Both of these are excluded by the traditional physicalist worldview while each logically follows from our alternative theory.

There are, of course, an absolutely enormous number of accounts of delocalized, dissociative, and expansive subjective experiences reported by countless individuals: out-of-body experiences, near-death experiences, transcendental meditation, the wide range of psychoactive chemicals and plants which induce dissociative and psychedelic experiences, and perhaps most obviously, dreams. Quite literally every person on earth has undergone at least one experience of this variety. The physicalist worldview crucially offers virtually no explanation for the existence of these delocalized, dissociative, and transcendental experiences reported widely across cultures and throughout history.

Such experiences fit in naturally with our alternative theory of individual conscious experiences as concentrations of a broader field, assuming our individual concentrations can be lessened or broadened. This, of course, would imply a lessening of an individual's brain activity corresponding with a heightening of subjective experience of transcendence or dislocation – whereas the physicalist would imagine brain activity would increase as the subjective experience was intensified – and our counter-physicalist prediction is exactly what we find. Psychedelic experiences have been associated with substantial decreases in brain activity, something in every way backwards and inconceivable in a traditional physicalist worldview. A study done at the University of Oxford in 2011 reported, "As predicted, profound changes in consciousness were observed after psilocybin, but surprisingly, only decreases in cerebral blood flow and BOLD signal were seen, and these were maximal in hub regions, such as the thalamus and anterior and posterior cingulate cortex (ACC and PCC). Decreased activity in the ACC/medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC) was a consistent finding and the magnitude of this decrease predicted the intensity of the subjective effects." Similar findings are associable with meditation and near-death experiences, with decreases and even cessation of neurological activity corresponding with intense and highly dissociated states of consciousness.[1]

These powerful subjective experiences are widely accounted for by not just personal accounts but also large scholarly studies and correspond precisely with our model of consciousness as being merely "channeled" or "concentrated" by brain states rather than miraculously arising from them. And yet these experiences contradict physicalism so severely that physicalists have developed a disdain for these sorts of experiences entirely, and any mention of out-of-body, psychedelic, or meditative experiences are prone to be met with hostility in academia, seen as perhaps fabricated or conspiratorial in their inability to be worked into a traditionally physicalist worldview. They are, however, precisely in line with the theory of consciousness as an underlying fabric of reality itself, which is precisely in line with our empirical evidence. And this is the case with a variety of phenomena which cannot be so readily dismissed as somehow invalid, such as blindsight (the ability to experience sight despite the absence of sensory input), which becomes far more explicable when our experiences of the world are not limited to their associated sensory and neurological faculties. Most unavoidably of all, dreams, bizarre subjective experiences undoubtedly routinely had by even the most hard-and-fast physicalist, remain inexplicable in physicalism, whereas when seen as the dislocation or dispersion of a concentrated consciousness, dreams become considerably more comprehensible.

We have analyzed most notable renditions of physicalism and have found that, even if we are lenient, it has a habit of self-denial and contradiction. It is undoubtedly fashionable and intuitive, but it crumbles under closer evaluation. When we examine empirical reality, we find only perspectivity, subjectivity, and experientiality – indeed, we cannot even conceive of the smallest, simplest thing without these. Consciousness

appears to underlie all reality and all potential reality, and the "world" we experience is a manifestation within consciousness, always and inescapably non-objective. The implications of such a perspective are varied and foreign, and perhaps most daunting is the very real sense in which the objects that arise in our experience, objects which we conventionally think of as being physical and external, are subjective and perspectival. The border between physical objects and ideas becomes much fuzzier. This world, despite its superficial similarities to the physicalist's world, can differ vastly in its implications, and while many of these implications would require entire papers of their own to explore at length, others can actually be observed and experimented for. Understanding consciousness as an extended capacity does not come naturally or readily and may require the reconsideration of many default, conventional assumptions we have about our world – but when critically analyzed and viscerally digested, it opens doors that physicalism had shut, and others which had been masked entirely. As long as these doors remained closed and physicalism, despite its failings, continues to quietly permeate all of philosophical discourse, our intellectual progress will be unnecessarily constrained and our understanding of reality itself will remain stifled and confused.

[1] *As a matter of clarity, I don't lend much weight to neuroscience as a general rule. I'm not particularly concerned with the findings of what the brain does or doesn't do under these or those conditions. I include this in order to make clear the internal contradictions of physicalism and the idea of brain-based consciousness.*

AesirAnatman - Dream experiences related to the supposed relation between the mind and the brain

So we all know the two basic arguments used to assert that the mind is identical with or rooted in the waking brain.

1) Chemicals which affect the brain alter your mind. Therefore your mind is influenced by physical objects.

2) Different regions of the brain can be measured and associated in their activity with various forms of mental activity.

Of course in principle these are obviously fallacious arguments because in principle you could have similar dream experiences regarding dream brains. However, arguments are much less convincing than experience so I set out to have the corresponding dream experiences myself.

The first one I had many months ago. It was a non lucid dream. I was in a grocery store at night shopping. I met a friend there and he asked me if I wanted to smoke cannabis and I did. So we went out and smoked. Within a few seconds I began to feel high. But not like I was high on weed awake. It was a totally unique altered state of consciousness. I woke up later and was thinking 'wtf!? How did dream neurochemicals affect my dream brain and then my chemically altered dream brain affect my consciousness?' I realized it was all an illusion of my unconscious dreaming mind. Then I thought 'aha! Well of course it was and so it is when I use any mind altering chemical when awake, even something like caffeine!' This dream arose in context of a lot of contemplation of the nature of drugs and psychonautics in relation to subjective idealism.

After the first dream I decided I wanted to have one other similar dream experience. I wanted to get a brain scan from a dream doctor and have them explain how the dream brain regions affected my mind. I commanded myself to create this sort of dream during my next random lucid dream. I visualized the basics of what doing that would feel like and habituated the idea that this is what I would do in my next lucid dream. A couple months later I had this dream when I became lucid. When I became lucid I decided that I had an appointment set up at a local brain doctors office. I then decided that the office was just down the street. I entered the building and the decor was unusual for a doctor's office. Occult symbolism everywhere. Pentagrams, books about voodoo, the tree of life, little talismans everywhere. I walked into the office where I decided they had the brain scan machine and the doctor was waiting. I sat in the chair opposite the doctor and their brain scan technology was different from ours. It was a c-shaped piece of metal which moved above your head from front to back and there was something like an iPad in front of me and one in front of the doctor which displayed info about the system. The doctor tried to have a conversation with me but I knew the risks for me of getting lost in a conversation with a dream character while lucid, so I ignored her and clicked the go button on my screen. It happened very fast. Then I got up and looked at the doctors screen where the results were shown. It was different from what our brain readouts look like. This was brain shaped, but it was a 3d network of lines indicating connecting parts of my dream brain. Where the lines connected were brain nodes. Each node had a number associated with it indicating the level of development and degree of use of that node. Different regions were marked in different colors to indicate function. After I understood the results of the scan I immediately became bored and flew out the window superman style to go have lucid dream fun. My experience with brain scans and drugs and conversations about brains causing behavior and

feelings had totally changed. I just don't take the ideas seriously anymore. They no longer feel like an ideological threat.

Theses two experiences, particularly the second, have deeply solidified my view of brain centered arguments for the nature of the mind as totally unconvincing.

mindseal - Why might anyone want to study subjective idealism?

On the face of it subjective idealism appears to have frighteningly little content. To briefly summarize it, what does subjective idealism propose?

1. Firstly, all that can be known and experienced is a product of one's own mind.
2. Secondly, one's own mind cannot be understood in terms of one or any set of its products.
3. Thirdly, all the specifics of knowledge and experience are volitional or subjective. (Volitional and subjective are synonyms here. They mean the same thing.)

And that's about it.

So isn't this rather thin? This philosophy tells us nothing about the color of the sky, or whether or not there even is such a thing as the sky. It tells us nothing about the shape and the size of any body. It tells us nothing about whether or not music exists and which sort of music is best. It tells us nothing about space and time even! It tells us nothing about the number of sentient beings: is there just one or are there many? Although it does suggest there is at least one sentient being: the reader. It tells us nothing about how best to relate to experience, including when we experience ourselves to be in the presence of what we believe to be other sentient beings.

Even from the POV of aesthetics, subjective idealism is so abstract, that to find beauty in it requires a very particular sense of beauty tending toward maximum parsimony and simplicity. So there is a possibility of someone studying it for its aesthetic beauty, but I want contend it won't be that for most people who might want to study it.

So what might the utility be?

Hypothetically a subjective idealist can hold any sort of axiomatic commitment(s). A subjective idealist can even hold a commitment to the axioms of physicalism. If so, what is the difference then between a subjective idealist holding a commitment to physicalism and a bona fide physicalist? The difference is that a bona fide physicalist doesn't feel that the postulates of physicalism are a choice. A physicalist will feel as though the truth of physicalism somehow impresses itself upon the mind whether one likes it or not. So in other words, in the language of subjective idealism, a physicalist is someone who has othered or disowned one's own commitment to physicalism and is no longer consciously aware of it.

And these sorts of othered commitments can be the strongest ones. These are the commitments that are tacit, unspoken, default, instintinctual. They're unspoken because they're so "obvious" that they don't need to be mentioned. They're so widely and pervasively assumed in the subjective sphere of one's own mind that one needn't discuss or think about them. And there is a lot of power in this. Allowing one's own commitment to become tacit and implicit to the greatest possible degree makes the experiential consequences of that commitment very stable and densely apparent.

And now we can understand why someone might want to study subjective idealism.

Simply put contemplating subjective idealism returns a sense of personal conscious choice to one's deepest core commitments. And this in turn opens up the possibility of making a change at the most profound level of one's relationship to one's sphere of experience.

This suggests a strong theme of discontentment at the deepest level of one's phenomenal reality. Why would anyone even think about changing one's fundamental axioms about phenomenal reality if the person considered them even remotely workable?

And it also suggests that one is considering alternative commitments. So if not physicalism, what then? I suggest that subjective idealism itself is too thin, too abstract, and so I don't think it can replace physicalism by itself. Becoming consciously aware of one's commitment to physicalism weakens that commitment, but if we're not going to contemplate any alternatives, there is no point in weakening one's perception of physicalism.

Another thing to consider is, do we want to jump to just one long-term alternative? Or do we want to develop a more complex system of relating to one's experience through the lens of more than one commitment in parallel?

And if more than one, then how many? Two? Three? More?

There are so many possibilities here that I cannot even imagine them all. I just intuitively feel that the choice here is mindblowingly wide open. My own ready imagination is restricted by prior expectations. What I might be able to imagine tomorrow might be different from what I can imagine today. What one can imagine in principle is different from what can readily imagine right now.

One choice that's obvious to me personally is going for subjective idealism plus a dual combination of physicalism and solipsism. So one way to exercise this is to relate to one's experience as a physicalist during most typical activity, but to relate to one's experience as a solipsist during a magickal ritual. There are many possibilities, and this is only one, just as an example. Another possibility is to relate to one's experience as a physicalist when comfortable, but in times of crisis relate to one's experience as a solipsist. An obligatory car metaphor is that you use cruise control when the driving is safe, but take manual control of the car when it's potentially dangerous. So this presupposes being able to shift one's manner of relating when necessary, and this implies that one has to be aware that even such fundamental and axiomatic commitments as physicalism are voluntary, and this is exactly what studying subjective idealism can accomplish.

Other slightly less obvious possibilities can include: living with the ability to switch on demand between animism and solipsism. Jumping to full-time animism, where subjective idealism is only a realtively brief transitional period necessary to accomplish the jump. One can even live with the ability to switch between physicalism, animism and solipsism. Or one can live with the ability to switch between animism and physicalism under the framework of subjective idealism.

So it seems to me that if one wants to be able to switch rapidly between two or more sets of fundamental axioms regarding how to relate to one's experience, then subjective idealism is helpful on a long term basis.

And if one wants to just switch from physicalism to animism, then subjective idealism can be helpful as a transitioning phase, after which one can become a bona fide animist.

Another possible reason to study subjective idealism is to gain the ability to update significant details in your otherwise favorite system of core belief. So with the aid of subjective idealism one could shift one's commitment from physicalism A to physicalism B. As an example, maybe in physicalism A faster than light travel is impossible, and in physicalism B it is possible.

There is another powerful reason to never become bona fide anything other than a subjective idealist. And that is, you may realize that no set of axioms about how to best relate to your subjective experience is going to be desirable forever. Since you anticipate the need to switch at some point when you grow tired of a certain way of life, you may want to *keep yourself ready* for such change by having never allowed yourself to get to the point where some core metaphysical commitments have become instinctive and unconscious. That way if you realize you may want to live 30 human lifetimes as an animist, you could do that, and then on your 30th lifetime you could switch to say physicalism without any particulalry arduous spiritual effort, provided you kept yourself a subjective idealist with a commitment to animism and never became a bona fide animist.

[...]

> A: Subjective Idealism is a good place to be in during physical danger as well. Re-label the danger as neutral or even a big positive and suddenly you're out of danger. Then you can drop back into a sort of physicalism, safe and sound. If you're in the process of losing your house, re-label the experience as A Brave New Adventure and BAM everything is great! This is what I was talking about when I mentioned stepping out into a 3D world and coming back into the 2D world at your own discretion.

I agree. I think a lot of people actually do this on an instinct during times of perceived great danger. There is a secret subjective idealist lurking below the surface in quite a few people the way I see it.

> A: I can have conversations with my surroundings with the full understanding that it hears me in its own way.

Exactly. :) If you're talking to your surroundings and especially if they talk back to you, that's animism.

In case someone here doesn't know, animism is a worldview that says even a forest or an ocean can have subjective inner being and you can talk to them in a meaningful way. So as an animist you can ask the forest to help you hunt, for example. Or you can ask the sky to rain. Or you can ask the wind about the location of something and then listen for how the wind will answer. That's animism in action. To an animist the wind is not an inanimate force. An animist can also talk to plants and plants will talk back to them. From a physicalist perspective all that is sheer insanity. Whereas some olde tyme shaman will just go "Yea, if I want to know whether the plant is edible or not, I just ask it, and they also tell me what sorts of diseases they're good at healing."

Personally I have very limited contact with animism. I've never been able to talk to a plant and I haven't really wanted to either. But I do think the idea is interesting and worth keeping somewhere in my mind. Animism is very rare in the world as I know it. I think all the different ways of relating to one's experience are at least nominally interesting.

> A: Are there any other systems you have experimented with switching to in this manner?

Not that I know of, so the answer is either "no" or "if it happened it must have been unconscious."

I'm mostly interested in subjective idealism, solipsism and physicalism. I play with the idea of talking to various deities sometimes. So for example, I think about Odin or Freya sometimes. I don't get all that involved in such thinking. I'm not sure what to call this kind of belief structure where you believe there are invisible forces at play. Maybe spiritism? Generally I don't dive too deeply into it because I don't like being at the mercy of the various unconscious forces. But I do think it can be interesting. Particularly if I could establish a really reliable base of understanding and experience, maybe I could then deliberately expose myself to some more destabilizing forces just for fun, but that's not anything that I plan to do in the near future.

> A: That idea of conscious spiritism is interesting. :) I did it unconsciously when I was younger. I was religious and also believed in spirits so it just felt like the default. I remember looking into the dark and trying to see the monsters and demons. I've tried it recently and ended up undergoing accidental demonic possession. They came out of the dark and entered me. It was wonderful. They were very caring and heart-driven demons. So I've used spiritism in that manner recreationaly a handful of times.

That's interesting. And kudos to you on not being afraid. I've had a number of experiences where it felt like I was being manipulated by some unseen forces and generally I've been terrified. Like one time I was pulled through a wall into different dimension of sorts. One of the scariest times of me life. Haha.

> A: Thanks. There's a reason I wasn't afraid. I was having an awful, self-loathing day, and I had spent the latter half of it putting myself in every uncomfortable situation I could out of disdain for my self. I was feeling self-conscious so I forced myself to look people in the eye and wave and smile at them and talk to them. I was feeling lethargic so I force myself to walk for 4 hours at night. I was thirsty so I didn't buy a drink when I was out and about. That's all seriously useful for breaking through. Fuck our insecurities and uncomfort. Eat it up!

Ah, I do some of what you talk about here some of the time. But! I am hip to the danger of such thinking too. I refuse to fall into unconscious provism, be it proving something to others *or* to myself.

mindseal - Gaining confidence by facing challenges is limited.

When developing an ability to assert arbitrary propositions as knowledge it's necessary to have at least extraordinary courage, if not fearlessness. It is well known that one way to develop courage is by deliberately subjecting oneself to difficult experiences. Asceticism is a practice in that vein, but challenges don't have to be in the form of body denial or conventional personality denial as in the typical ascentic practices. Anything that puts one outside the comfort zone is a challenge.

For a thoroughgoing subjective idealist such challenges can at times be really outlandish, unreasonable and mad in order to be effective, because a more "usual" sort of challenge is just not necessarily going to be felt as a meaingful or interesting challenge. Plus, in order for a challenge to be effective at liberating one from rigid conventional habits it has to be intimately conceived. If one seeks freedom one must only undertake challenges of one's own design and refuse all other challenges as meaningless. That way one can take conscious responsibility for the challenge as well as understand the ins and outs of why this or that area of personal sensitivity must be faced head on in some case that's particular to one's subjective state. That way a challenge will fit neatly into one's own unique manner of development and it will correspond to one's personality in a way that's authentic.

Plus, I don't hear about many spiritually liberated people who are good at hitting the boss' deadlines. So rising to other people's challenges is something I consider a total waste of one's time and I don't recommend it. If ever the word gets around, you might have a line of trolls coming your way with all kinds of challenges for you. Plus, rising to other people's challenges is generally done with the desire to satisfy those people's expectations rather than one's own. But it is yourself that you have to convince of your capability and no one else.

Consider how this or that challenge would fit into your plan to liberate yourself from convention.

But there is a problem with challenges. The problem is that challenges don't prove anything, even to yourself. After all, if you rise to the occasion once, maybe it was a fluke right? So maybe you have to do it twice. But then again, two times might have been a fluke, so three times is better. But wait, those three times don't count because you were young and strong. Now that you're older you have to do it again to see if you can still do it when older. And so on. In other words, if one wants to doubt oneself, the possibility for a doubting narrative is *always* there!

That's why challenging oneself can easily become a trap of perpetual insecurity where one constantly feels the need to overcome this, that, and the other, to repeatedly prove to oneself one's own greatness. One might even come up with a slogan for this hapless attitude, "I'm only as good as my last challenge!" Maybe it will sound familiar.

Someone wise in the way of subjective idealism will recognize this trap.

The goal then is not to prove anything. The goal is to learn how to rest in the knowledge of capability, no matter what. It is that state of knowing that's the goal. Because ultimately such knowing cannot be justified

by anything, it is essentially madness. So trying to attain such a state through a means that's entirely reasonable is not likely to work.

What I find works best is to rise to this or that challenge on occasion, but to do so sparingly, and to know that one's state of confidence and capability cannot be earned or proven. It cannot be proven to others, and it cannot be proven even to oneself. Rather, the knowing of capability is simply assumed without anyone's approval or permission. Once assumed one then commits to living in line with that knowing. And that's all there is to it.

Of course one major reason why such a tactic can work is precisely because of subjective idealism. So if you understand what makes subjective idealism true, you're not going to be entirely unreasonable in your madness. Then you might only appear unreasonable from the POV of convention.

[...]

> Q: How much of a difference would it make to have actually done something, or just to have resolved to remember having done that thing? Is there any difference, in a subjective idealist world?

There'd be no inherent difference, but you can hold that there is a difference. Subjective idealism allows you to structure your experience however you want, so long as you recognize that's what you're doing and take responsibility for it.

> [[**A**: *Really* nice post. [What I find works best is to rise to this or that challenge on occasion]; Did this today. Went for a tennis match with an old friend and wound up *deciding* to have a really close match but ultimately beat him in deuce really late in the set. We wound up finishing 9-8 since "neither of us could break the other's serve". Like you said, no way it can be proven to yourself or anyone, you just decide to do it. [So if you understand what makes subjective idealism true, you're not going to be entirely unreasonable in your madness.]; Yeah its ultimately a structure of empowerment. One that happens to be incredibly consistent, perhaps irrefutable. Doing challenges for the sake of enjoyment is okay *if* it is in fact enjoyable. I think the second it becomes a tool for the sake of validation is the second you've outsourced your capacity to validate yourself *to* some activity, within which your success, or lack there of, will determine your feelings of worth. Doesnt make sense if **you are the final arbiter.**]]

mindseal - What is 'mind' the way I generally use the term here.

The mind is a threefold capacity to know, to will and to experience. I call it a "threefold capacity" because there is no knowing without willing and experiencing. No experiencing without knowing and willing. No willing without knowing and experiencing. In other words, the capacity is one indivisible whole, but for convenience we can identify three sides to it. There is a side of knowing. There is a side of willing. And a side of experiencing.

So from this it should be obvious that the mind as such is not any of the specific mental states, individually or in any combination.

So why don't I call it "consciousness" like some others? That's because we have a concept of subconsciousness, and there is even a concept of superconsciousness. Both sub- and super- are outside the range of customary awareness, but sub- is kind of dumb and it's best at following orders, whereas super- is more intelligent than your customary level of intelligence and is omniscient.

So because consciousness is bracketed by super- and sub- I find it best not to take consciousness as the ultimate ground. Instead I take mind as the ultimate ground. This avoids a mistake of taking the most obvious level of appearance as something ultimate. And this is consistent with a subjective idealist position of anti-realism, which is an idea that how things appear is not how they are. Another way to say this is that appearances are suggestive rather than informative. Appearances are subjective. They pertain to a certain commitment, to a certain manner of dreaming, and are not indications of anything "out there."

Also, knowledge with the most experience-defining power is tacit knowledge. The strongest and most influential knowledge is outside the customary range of consciousness, so drawing people's attention to consciousness will be bad form for the weird way. If you're going to want to play with your experience at the most profound level you will need to become reacquainted with the deepest and most implicit forms of knowledge. You'll have to make conscious what formerly was sub- and super- conscious so that you understand what's going on and why it's going that way. Once you understand it, you have the power to change it. You cannot change something you don't understand. If you don't understand yourself, you cannot change yourself. If you don't understand the world-appearance, you cannot manipulate it. You cannot manipulate a black box.

Or put another way, you're already always manipulating everything, but because of the narrowing of consciousness and because of being obsessive about certain narratives (primarily physicalism, but not limited to that), you lose awareness of the options that you still have and it then feels like things are beyond your control. In fact getting things to feel as though they are outside your control is one kind of magick in and of itself.

So then what is knowledge? What's the difference between thinking and knowing or believing and knowing?

Knowledge is an assertion you're willing to *stand on* without hesitation and without wavering. Because such assertions are ultimately not grounded in anything other than your own commitment to them, they're in a

sense insane (depending on how we define insanity). So all knowledge, as my friend Aesir puts it can be regarded as a form of insanity:

> **AesirAnatman**: If we start with the conventional idea that having confidence in a belief without justification is irrational and insane, then all beliefs, all possible perspectives, are insane. There are no objective, perspectiveless perspectives. All belief systems are fundamentally irrational and baseless. Because you must adopt some perspective to live, consider your present mode of insanity. Understand it, and find the ungrounded assumptions which guide your life. Is this the insanity you desire over all other possible insanities? Is your subjective reality working the way you want?

I am pretty fond of this paragraph.

So thinking is the most volatile mental activity, and believing is when some ideas begin to gain prominence in your mind as your commitment deepens. Beliefs affect behaviors and major life choices. And the strongest and most implicit form of commitment is knowledge. Compare "I believe the sun will rise tomorrow" to "I know the sun will rise tomorrow."

Probably most knowledge of the kind we'd be interested investigating is something habituated and tacit because once you refuse to waver on an assertion and begin living with it, it becomes more and more automatic, and once it becomes fully automatic it slides away from your consciousness, you don't notice it anymore per se, unless you remain vigilant. But when potential knowledge drops down to its tacit form and becomes actual lived knowledge, it's the most powerful! So for example, how much do you doubt that the sun will rise tomorrow? How often do you think about the sun rising tomorrow? I bet zero times on most days? Probably zero times in any given decade? If you ever doubted such a thing, it's probably just now. But probably not even now. Probably even me asking the question about the sun maybe not rising tomorrow is not enough to stir genuine doubt. This is the power of knowledge. You *know* the sun will rise tomorrow. That's the power of your subjectivity!

Subjectivity is not a gradient. It's not possible for you to be more subjective or less. It's not possible for anything else to be more or less subjective. For something to be subjective it must pertain to a point of view. What does it mean something pertains to a point of view? It means something only makes sense or only appears under certain mental conditions and at no other time. If something pertains to a point of view, it means outside of that specific point of view, it is inaccessible, unknowable. If you understand subjective idealism, you have to realize that all specific features of your experience from the subtlest to the grossest levels are private and unique to your point of view.

It's crucial to understand what a "point of view" really is. It's not the case that Nefandi has one point of view and Aesir another and so on for everyone of 7 billion people. No, no, no. That's not subjective idealism at all. In subjective idealism the understanding is that I have a point of view. From that singular point of view I experience Nefandi and all the other people. All these experiences pertain to this one singular point of view of mine. And because of that, once I begin dreaming, I usually don't know about Aesir, since it's not pertinent in most of my nighttime dreams. Of course the potential to restore the waking context exists in a *typical* nighttime dream, and thus subconsciously the notion of Aesir is still available as part of my commitment (overall mindset). But the point is, everything I know about any other person I only know *because* I have a

point of view! In other words, I can't really know something that's not my point of view. I have no access to such!

So subjectivity is total and it doesn't come in degrees. Subjectivity doesn't increase or decrease. Instead *the content* of subjectivity can change. But the fact that all content is subjective is not going to change. The changes in content will fall along customary patterns most of the time, but if you change your commitment, the change in experiential pattern can be radical.

Generally the mind tends to operate in a certain style. It means certain themes are recurrent. Certain types of mental activity are habitual and recur regularly. A style of mental life can be called 'a mindset.' It is crucial to be able to distinguish the mind from a mindset.

The mind is a threefold capacity to know, to will and to experience. But a mindset is a specific style, a specific manner of using that capacity. That specific manner of using mental capacity can also be referred to as 'a commitment.' It's a commitment when you park on it and stay there. So you develop a certain style of mentation centered on certain postulates, and you park there. Once that's done, your postulates (gradually) acquire the weight of knowledge and drop away from your customary consciousness (unless you're doing something weird with your mind), and at that same time these postulates gain immense power, even to the point where people feel trapped by those postulates and begin seeking liberation.

If you understand anything I am talking about here you must immediately realize something like, "wait a second, so ultimately I am not even a human being." If you're thinking that way, you're probably really getting what I am talking about. If it never occurred to you to question your humanity or your membership on planet Earth, then you are reading what I am saying without any significant understanding.

mindseal - Othering: subconscious mind is both helpful and problematic for the same reason.

Subconscious mind is a region of our own mind that's been so-to-speak "othered." We "other" it because we don't want to do boring and uninspired tasks like growing our hair and nails. Which is to say, even inside what we customarily consider "our own" being, there is all sorts of automatism. This automatism implies that the mind that's performing alterations, such as adjustments to hair length, to skin texture, and so forth, is not entirely under our control, and mostly we like it that way and indeed, demand it.

So this has at least two implications. On the one hand, boring and stupid stuff gets done automatically in the background. But, and this is a big but, precisely because auto- means "on its own" and it implies othering, it can all go haywire. Our little bot-mind can become HAL-9000. Unlike HAL-9000 our subconscious mind is not literally a machine. I'm using "machine" here as a clumsy and inaccurate metaphor. How would you like a disease or a strange growth you didn't exactly ask for? It can happen precisely because we offload this sort of thing from our conscious awareness, and so we give an (deliberately and gleefully) ignored region of our mind the ability to make some degree of independent choices, and those choices are not always good ones.

We don't like the world to stand still, waiting, while we make a decision where to place each particle of it. This is why the subconscious mind is a form of autopilot.

The good news is, it's not a completely independent mind. Like a computer, it does accept input from its boss - you. Also, if you like, you can completely eliminate the subconscious region of the mind, but warning, if you do that, time as you know it will stop, because everything will become suspended in relation to your own mentation (mental activity, mental life). Your mentation is the only thing that will move, and nothing else, and so, if your mentation doesn't move, nothing at all moves. Which is a very scary state to be in, and you may not enjoy it.

We are lazy fools. We like easy entertainment. We ignore the saying "if you want something done right, do it yourself." We love outsourcing because we're trying to maximize profits and minimize personal responsibility. If you find your world running away from you, it's because you've been too obsessed with having fun while hoping the world will automatically do the right thing. But precisely because you don't attend to that which is automatic, it doesn't have to do the right thing forever. It can begin doing a thing on its own, a thing which you no longer like. If this happens, you have to smack its arse and remind it who is the boss. Remind your subconscious mind whose mind it's carved from. Remind your subconscious mind who is the witness of all its antics. What is a producer without audience? If necessary, annihilate and crush your subconscious mind, until it utterly submits to being either eliminated or reprogrammed. However, just reminding it that you may do so, with the full knowledge and intent, will often be sufficient to scare the bejesus out of it, and gain its compliance. This is why Jesus said, if your eye sins, tear it the fuck out. Meaning, don't spare it just because it's yours. Whack everything that stands in your way, even if it's you, or *claims* to be you. Then you'll be boss.

And then you can be lazy again, because your subconscious mind will show you exactly what you like seeing. You'll have fun and relax. And the cycle will repeat. But it's OK, because who has limitless time? You do. So you'll just whack your subconscious mind again when the time is right. No biggie.

mindseal - Twice perfect.

There are two polar complementary dimensions of experience: tolerance and expressiveness. When one's tolerance has been perfected there is no urgency to modify any experience to be something else, no matter what that experience may feel like. When one's expressiveness has been perfected, one regains the knowledge and the courage necessary to exercise intent along its full range of ultimate possibility, thus being able to manifest any experience that could be experienced even in principle. This second perfection we know as magick.

If you cultivate tolerance without expressiveness you'll be like a patient victim, able to endure but passive and lacking creativity. And if you cultivate expressiveness without tolerance, you'll be like a perpetually frightened maestro for whom magick is not a leisurely pleasure but a dire necessity at every turn in life.

May you all be twice perfect.

[...]

> Q: Stepping out of the system is tolerance. Stepping back in at your desired position is creativity. I question if someone can even perform creativity without first being tolerant of their subject. Otherwise it's a needy urge to react to the system's demands, which isn't creativity.

I agree that tolerance and expressiveness often work best together.

> Q: Money isn't desirable anymore! Shit is desirable! Literally collecting mounds of feces on your living room floor is the metric of ultimate worth!

I wouldn't go that far. Shit *can be* a measure of worth, just ask the dung beetles. But to say it literally is, that's a bit too much I think. Saying "can" or "can be" is often better than saying "is" imo.

> Q: If you have what you want already, then you can just sit there in your 3D world until your decidedly unavoidable Death once again brings ignorance, or you can have some fun with the infinite binaries of reality that you've discovered.

I was never born and will never die. It's only the dream body that was born, together with its dream context of a dreamed universe. I am not my experience. I am a capacity to know, to will and to experience. :)

mindseal - Subjective experiential anatomy of a person.

We've all heard of anatomy. Anatomy is body's structure. However, it's rare to talk about personal subjective anatomy. Subjectively we aren't our bodies. So then, what are we? What can we say about ourselves that is even remotely true? I will try to be as practical and as down to earth in my exposition as possible. Polemics do not interest me. What interests me is my own understanding and experience of what it's like to be me, and I imagine, you who read this are interested in what it's like for you to be you.

It's hard to say what I am and it's easier to say what I am not. So I want to begin with what I know I definitely am not. I know I am not anything that's optional, since I outlast all options. So for example, I know I am not a human body with its left arm up, because the left arm can be down and this doesn't remove the fact of personal experience. I know I am not a human body, because in dreams I've experienced myself with different bodies, sometimes even non-human ones, and still there I am able to exercise my will, able to know and able to experience. So all the things that appear to come and go, including the human body, and including the earthly world of convention which departs from the mind during every dream, I am not those things.

However, in all this there is a kind of constancy. There is a constancy of capacity. When my experience changes, my capacity for having an experience remains the same. So if during a spiritual vision I appear to have no solid body, my capacity to be able to experience myself as though I were inhabiting a solid body remains intact. When I close my eyelids, the view of the surrounding environment goes away, but my capacity to view the surrounding environment remains unchanged. So now a capacity appears to be a good candidate for what I really am. From experience and from analytical deduction, both, this capacity appears primordial. Even if I don't remember something, my capacity to have memory remains undiminished.

When I relax, my capacity for exertion doesn't drop off. When I tense up, my capacity for relaxation is not destroyed. This is true for any and all levels of relaxation and exertion.

Even if I can't *currently* exercise some area of a capacity, it doesn't mean I can't exercise it *even in principle*. For example, right now it's difficult for me to visualize an entire room with all its detailed contents, colors, textures and so on. But that and arbitrarily bigger and arbitrarily brighter visualizations are within my primordial capacity even if I do not yet have ready access to such. What we have ready access to can change, but it has no influence on the ultimate potential which doesn't oscillate.

I can contemplate my internal state and I can look out onto the surrounding environment. That means I am not located internally or externally, since both viewing directions are optional to me. So that means I am not inside anything. Nor am I outside anything. If I were inside something called "myself", I'd be surrounded by myself on all sides and be unable to examine the environment. Likewise, if I were inside something called "other," I'd be surrounded by the environment on all sides and be unable to examine that which we conventionally call "my own internal state."

Let's examine what happens when we might say "I feel cold." What happens? Who is cold? What is cold? It's not obvious at all and should be examined thoroughly. Right away I know the flesh of the body doesn't get cold, because no matter how cold the flesh gets on a body in the morgue, it doesn't suffer. Similarly, if I were to cut my arm off and freeze it, I wouldn't feel cold. So it can't be the body's flesh that gets cold when we say "I feel cold." So what else could it be? Does my mind get cold? Remember, the mind is a capacity. It's a capacity

to know, to experience and to will. Can a capacity get cold? That makes absolutely no sense at all, at least not in any ultimate sense, because ultimate capacity is always the same without any oscillation through time. OK, then what else could be cold? Not body. Not mind.

What else can get cold? I have an expectation of warmth. When that expectation becomes frustrated I report "I feel cold." So literally what gets cold is neither body nor mind, but my expectation and perhaps craving for warmth. But we don't usually say "my expectation and craving for warmth just got cold," do we? To me that's very, very interesting and useful to know.

We can say similar things about feeling hot, feeling pain, feeling itchy, and so on. Like what's itchy? Next time you might itch, try to remind yourself that neither your mind nor body can itch, and then see if you can meditate on that.

I've already mentioned capacity, and capacity has ultimate extent and ready extent. Your ready capacity is what you can do/be/experience either immediately or with very little training. And your ultimate capacity is what you can do/be/experience at all, in principle.

As I said the body is not what I am from the POV of ultimate capacity. However, from the POV of *ready* capacity, even though I am **still** not a specific human body, I am something related to it. So during every dream the conventional human body disappears and is replaced by a dream body, which for me on some occasions hasn't even been a human-looking or human-feeling one. And yet, I keep returning to something resembling the human body all the time. Not only do I return to a human body upon waking from a dream, but even in dreams there is a noticeable propensity for me to dream as though living through a human or human-like body. The specific visions of the body change often, roughly once a night at minimum, but the general character of me almost constantly centering myself on a vision of a human body remains the same in the near term. So what is that?

I've experienced myself dropping out of the human body while awake, and every time I felt fear and a desire to quickly recenter myself back in the familiar body experience. What is this? That's craving, (desired) expectation, habit. I'll just use expectation as the term. Strictly speaking we can analyze expectation the way we've analyzed getting cold. Who or what expects? We know the flesh doesn't expect anything. We know the ultimate capacity of mind doesn't expect anything either. So in an ultimate sense I am not my cravings or expectations, and yet I am dominated and affected by them so long as I don't take any measures to rid myself or free myself of them. But because I do have an option of ridding myself of any expectation, ultimately I can't be any specific expectation or any set of expectations. And yet, in practical terms, because I do commit myself to certain expectations, I become those expectations for the duration of commitment.

So although I know I am not a human body, from the POV of *ready* potential I must be an expectation for a human body. This is important. That means even at the relative level I can't say I am a human body. I am only an expectation of a human body, and this is something very subtle and very mental by nature, and hard to become aware of. The obvious thing to be aware of is the form of human body or the environment. But expectations aren't obvious nor is the understanding of oneself as a capacity, be it ultimate or ready.

mindseal - Why simplistic ego-bashing and ego-denial are not part of the weird way.

All experience is perspectival. Which is to say, whatever the present experience is like, there are other alternatives that could have been experienced but aren't now. That's what "perspective" means. It means no matter what the experience is, it's *never* reflective of every possibility. It's also precisely because of this we don't rely on evidence. Evidence lies.

This implies choice, selection. **It implies volition. So subjectivity implies volition.**

And vice versa. If we start with volition, we'll end up with subjectivity.

Because of that, whoever is reading this, know that you can't ever die. Your conventional body could die and if or when it dies, it disappears as a vision in front of you or in front of others. It dies *because* someone is there to see it die. You were never born. All you can do is transform your perspective. But your perspective isn't created or destroyed except maybe from another perspective! But those other perspectives are just that: subjective perspectives! Not the truth. Not anything objective. Not gospel. Not data. Not dogma. Not "how it is." Even 100 billion such perspectives seemingly working together do *not* and cannot depart from subjectivity. If 100 people like strawberry ice cream, it doesn't make it less of a preference than if only 1 person liked it.

So if you understand this properly, you'll realize your own perspective should be the most important perspective for you. Your own perspective is the perspective by which you live or die, by which you rise or fall, and by which you feel pain or pleasure, and by which you experience wisdom or foolishness. Let me repeat: your own perspective. Your own. Not mine. Not hers. Not his. Not its. Just yours!

So a conventional image has a problem in that it's a story of limitation. For example, you're a man or a woman, but you can't switch or be both according to convention. (A hermaphrodite is neither man nor woman because to be both man and a woman means to satisfy the conventional demands of both men and women, and hermaphrodites cannot satisfy either such demand.) Nor can you be a neuter. According to convention you can only be in one place and not in two places at once. And of course there are more limitations that I don't have the time to enumerate. So *that's* the limitation a specific *kind* of self-image imposes, the kind that appears to be common wherever I look (I probably have something to do with it, yea?).

So don't bash your ego. Don't bash your image. Don't deny yourself or try to destroy yourself. Whatever you do, you'll always be something or someone experiencing something. Always. You don't have to be human. You don't need to have a body seemingly made of flesh (which is to say, you don't have to revolve around a tactile/kinesthetic structure in your experience). You'll never succeed in ridding yourself of yourself in any kind of *metaphysical sense*.

Listen, whatever you *actually* are, you can never change it. And whatever it is you aren't, you can never become it. So if you are anything, you can't get rid of it. And if you aren't something already, you can't become it. Think about it long and hard.

So when you perform magickal transformations, including when you transform your image or persona, please understand. There is something that transforms. And something that doesn't transform. If you have no idea what it is in you that doesn't transform you'll never achieve greatness. And if you think you'll someday be ego-

less, you're just wasting yours and other people's time with that dead-end idea. You'll always experience something and not something else. Even if you experience everything, then you're not experiencing a small fragment, so even "everything" would be a choice, and a limited one.

What's never limited is your potential. Your potential is not limited now. Hasn't ever been. And never will be limited. But whatever fragment of that infinite potential you will want to emphasize, stabilize, make bright, familiar, and reliable, it will always only and ever be a fragment. And that's OK.

So you'll always have some self-image. You'll never get rid of it. The best you can do is *stop being unconsciously inflexible about the specifics of what and who you appear to be* to yourself and to others. Stop bashing yourself because some Zen moron called "Zen master with an inka" told you to. Stop seeking mindless annihilation, because you won't find it. But if you think you can find it, fine, do it. Go ahead.

AesirAnatman - Modes of Reality Construction

Background Ideas

First, all of these modes of reality construction are contrasted in terms of how you relate your perspective to other perspectives. This is the essential differentiating idea. So, what is a perspective? At root, a perspective is a set of memories, beliefs, expectations, experiences, etc. which is contrasted with other sets of memories, beliefs, expectations, experiences, etc. (other perspectives). A perspective is a shape that intent can take. Your intent can take infinite shapes, so there are infinite perspectives available to you in the realm of potentiality. Whatever shape your intent presently takes is your actual, or manifest, perspective, as opposed to all the potential, or unmanifest, perspectives. (Don't take the distinction between actual and potential 100% literally here. The two blur into each other)

Objects and appearances

Second, let's look at what our idea of an 'object' is. An object is different from an object-appearance. The object-appearance is the immediate phenomenal aspect of an object. For a tree, the object-appearance is the visual appearances of the treebark and the leaves, the tactile appearances of the roughness of bark and smoothness of leaves, the fragrence of the flowers, etc. This is the object-appearance of a tree. Now what is our idea of the tree itself apart from these immediate appearances? We think the tree as a history as part of the world. And a future. We think the tree-appearance will transform and change in a coherent way according to the laws of nature which we think govern the transformation of tree-appearances. Our expectation that the tree consists of certain other tree-appearances if we touch it or look at it from a different spatial position than present. All of this can be summarized by saying that we have beliefs about how tree-appearances manifest and transform in our experience and world. The 'object' that is the tree is your memories, beliefs, expectations, narratives, etc. about this tree-appearance beyond it's immediate phenomenal character. The 'object' that is a tree is your *idea* of the tree. So, we have objects, and object-appearances (also, don't take the distinction between objects and object-appearences 100% literally. However it is very useful at this level of contemplation, imo).

Bodies and perspectives

Third, most objects that appear to us are conceptualized as in some way being dead. That is, they are not sentient – they are rigid material mechanisms, or rigid energetic flows, guided by some dead, fixed principles of motion and transformation. However, some objects are associated with perspectives. They are objects associated with life and sentience. We call these objects bodies. What are bodies and how do they work? How do we associate perspectives with bodies?

First, we need to differentiate three things here: body-appearances, bodies, and perspectives. Body-appearances and bodies are respectively a form of object-appearances and objects. The body-appearance of my friend is the way his body and face look, the way his voice sounds, or the way his body feels if touched. The body of my friend is my conception of that appearance associated with a 3D spatial object that I believe can be viewed from all sides, can move and transform according to certain physical rules, etc. The perspective is the state of mind I think of as governing the motion and changes of the body. This is in contrast to that which I conceptualize as governing the motion of dead objects: the laws of nature.

Just as the laws of nature are something I conceptualize as governing objects (which are ideas I use to give meaning to object-appearances), so too are other-perspectives something I conceptualize as governing bodies (which are ideas I use to give meaning to body-appearances). When I conceptualize an other-perspective, I can only imagine it as a perspective I could have. I cannot imagine a perspective from an outside POV. That's impossible (which is why we call perspectives subjective).

Observation v. Magick

Now, in general there are two opposing ways to approach apparent objects in the world. Either you watch your unconscious habitual manifestations of object-appearances and learn your unconscious ways of modeling objects, and you strengthen and reify those models (this is what implicitly happens when people assume objects are self-existent and external), or you exercise conscious magical transformative power over your idea of the object and the object appearance, to adjust your models of how objects and appearances unfold and manifest.

Of course, this applies to objects like trees. When we assume the world is self-existing, i.e. when we want to understand our own habitual models of manifestation without destroying them, then we observe the world. By doing so we learn what patterns of manifestation are normal. As we develop an understanding of our own intentions and make them conscious, we can learn to use those understandings to interact with the world consciously and meaningfully. This is how we can come to learn how trees, or metals function in the world. We don't tamper with those manifestations consciously (for the most part anyway), and instead learn to understand them. Similarly, you can learn to make your intentions of how trees function conscious and familiar to you and then transform those intentions consciously. This transformation is called magick. Magick, or direct willful transformation of your intentions rather than the strict observation of them, is the way you control your body.

However, this also applies to the perspectives of others. When we assume other perspectives are self-existing, i.e. when we want to understand our own habitually manifested models of other-perspectives, then we observe the bodies of others. By doing so, we learn what sorts of intentions these other-perspectives consist of. We can only do this if we have a system of translating the actions of bodies into understandable intentions. But, the details of how that functions, and how from that language develops, are for another post. Anyway, as we develop an understanding of our own intentionally othered-perspectives and make them conscious, we can learn to use those understandings to interact with others consciously and meaningfully. This is how we can come to learn about the perspectives of others in the world. We don't tamper with those manifested perspectives consciously (for the most part anyway), and instead learn to understand them. Similarly to with objects, you can learn to make your intentionally othered perspectives conscious and familiar to you and then transform those perspectives consciously. This transformation is also called magick (specifically telepathic influence magick, and is often looked down on by humans).

The Modes of Reality Construction

In context of all of this, let's look at the three reality-construction modes I proposed in my original comment: Anarchic, Democratic, and Despotic.

Anarchic or Solipsistic

In the Anarchic mode, there is no respect for other-perspectives. An individual conforms their beliefs about objects, the world, and other perspectives to whatever they want and expeirences the world in context of their newly created beliefs. Such an individual is regarded as completely crazy and insane by human, worldly standards. In fact, any convention whatsoever other than conventions consciously created and maintained by lucid beings would consider this mode insane. That's because humans usually think there is a 'real world' out there and changing your experiences and beliefs won't change the actual reality, which means you could risk destroying your real body and living in a state of delusion and hallucination. This mode, from the subjective idealist perspective, is by far the most powerful. It also can be the most isolating if misused (unless isolation is what you're looking for).

Democratic

In the Democratic mode, there is roughly equal respect for other-perspectives and your own-perspective. An individual conforms their beliefs about objects, the world, and other perspectives according to some collective system, and experiences the world in context of those new beliefs. There are two primary species of the Democratic mode: the scientific, and the magickal. In the scientific species, you study your own mental habits of manifestation (the patterns of phenomena in your experience). Others also study the patterns of phenomena in their experience (their mental habits of manifestation). Then, you come together and compare notes. Everyone agrees to believe whatever patterns were most common for most people, and to conform their minds to this majority habit. Eventually, deviant mental habits are eliminated and the world becomes more and more solid and stable and the same for everyone and not subject to alteration. In the scientific mode, this can continue until even models of how your inner worlds develop and people start to lose a sense of power over their inner worlds (e.g. my mind works according to fixed, scientific, rules = defining your own mental action in terms of chemicals, psychological models, etc.). Generally, this view is done with the belief that some 'truth' is being approached and more is being learned about it. It is hypothetically possible, however, to engage in the scientific mode from a lucid POV, if you so chose.

The other major species of the Democratic mode is the magickal mode. In the magickal mode, we don't all conform our minds more and more to our collective fixed habits. Instead, we all believe that everyone's beliefs exert some degree of influence on reality. i.e. you conform your mind to whatever most people believe, and everyone else does the same. The biggest difference with this mode is that you and others also have a role in shaping or altering reality. There is an understanding that individual can put pressure on the group-reality, and alter it somewhat. The more people who jump on board, the more your group-reality is altered. So, in this view, because most people are physicalists, the world will appear physicalistic. But if most people started to become animists, the world would start to look more animistic (i.e. in both circumstances, as other people's views changed, you would start to alter your views). Similarly, it might be the case that magickal traditions and beliefs that historically had more adherents might be more powerful than new traditions, if you make it a democracy of all people in history. Conversely, it might be a democracy only of all people presently alive, which would mean whatever belief-systems are most popular right now would be most powerful and most influential in reality. In this world, everyone can use magickal influence to exert *some* pressure on the nature of reality, but no one will override it 100%. So, you are less powerful than in the anarchic mode, but you still have a little power. And it allows for other people to self-define mostly. Of course, it's possible that the beings in your realm decide collective to take there reality to a place you don't want to go, just like the scientific mode

or the Despotic mode. This mode can easily be imagined as a self-reified mode (the beings participating might consider it the 'real' or 'right' way that reality works), or as a lucid game mode.

Despotic

Last, the Despotic mode. This one is simple enough. It's when you conform your mind to another person or group's conception of reality. This takes two ordinary forms: either the adherents believe the authorities have some sort of privileged access to 'truth' (the 'right' beliefs) and they want to know those right beliefs and conform their personal beliefs to the truth (which would encompass organized religions and cults). OR. The adherents are forced to conform their minds to the authorities because the authorities have some sort of power over them (i.e. a state forcing masses of people to believe a religion (Medieval Christianity in Europe) or to believe state propaganda (totalitarian regimes)). I guess in principle a lucid individual might choose to conform their mind 100% to the view of another just as a game. Hmm...In fact, I just came up with a strange lucid/transcendent beings game that enlightened persons might play: imagine a system of rotating authorities. Every 2 years (or something), we let someone new be the authority on our group reality for a little while. That's something lucid beings might in principle choose to do.

Closing

I think there's a lot of fertile ground here for exploration of particular views and dream-modes and dream-games we could adhere to. But, it's important to remember that cultivating lucidity means realizing your power to transform your mind into any of these and other modes, and maintaining consciousness of your responsibility for and power over that state of mind throughout your experience. This is what I mean when I say you are the Lord God Almighty. I'm reminding you of your power over your frame of mind. I'm trying to wake you up and get you to be lucid.

So, my friends, may this dream-decoration on your ever-perfect mind serve you as a tool to help you dream the dream of waking up.

AesirAnatman - Relativism: Reality is a Contemplation of the Hypothetical

An Argument for Epistemological Skepticism

The most straightforward and common definition of knowledge offered by convention is that knowledge is justified, true belief.

First, knowledge cannot be true or false when there is no objective world to which your subjective beliefs might correspond. If you believe the sky is blue, you are not right or wrong, because there is no actual sky that is either blue or not-blue. There are only your experiences, memories, expectations, and structuring beliefs.

Second, knowledge cannot be ultimately justified. For a belief to be justified, it must be justified by other beliefs. So, the justifying beliefs for (C) “Socrates was mortal” are: (P1) “Socrates was a human” and (P2) “All humans are mortal”. But this justification is only contextual, presently. It assumes that P1 and P2 are already accepted as true. But, for C to be ultimately justified, we need to justify P1 and P2 as well.

Further, whatever beliefs justify P1 and P2 themselves would need to be justified in order to ultimately justify C, ad infinitum. If knowledge requires an infinite chain of justification, then there are no beliefs that have ever been ultimately justified.

Thus, *knowledge, as conventionally understood, is impossible.*

Maintaining rationality in context of illusion

Instead of being ultimate, it's obvious that justification is only and ever contextual. It's a way of demonstrating what beliefs make sense in context of certain assumed beliefs. It's important to note that you are free to believe things that conflict with your other beliefs. Contemplating your own belief-system and refining it is not mandatory. Rationality is a choice. The less self-critical you are, the more conflict will exist between your beliefs (and the less stable of a realm you will be able to manifest). The more self-critical you are, the more coherent your beliefs will be (and the more stable your manifested realm will be).

Coherency is the standard of rationality, not truth or ultimate justification. Completely opposing worldviews can both be 100% internally coherent and therefore 100% rational. This is because your primary beliefs are not, and cannot, themselves be justified by other beliefs.

Infinite opposing beliefs, which are themselves unjustifiable, stand before you in the realm of potentiality. You may assume any belief, and, as long as you assume it, you will start to structure your mind according to that belief. If you maintain that belief for an extended time, then your memories, experiences, and expectations will shift until your reality completely coheres with that belief. This is the nature of illusion.

Rationality is possible, even when your beliefs are only rooted in potentiality (that is, are hypothetical and illusory).

Manifestation: Contemplating the hypothetical

I want to explore the nature of this assumption of belief. When we assume a belief, we are adopting a possible way of structuring the mind. Our belief doesn't become categorically true when we believe it (because nothing is categorically true), rather it is a hypothetical model we are focusing on and emphasizing. We may be accustomed to focusing on one particular hypothetical model of reality and possible way of structuring the mind. This accustomation, or habit, is what makes it seem effortful or difficult to focus on a new belief system - to magically change the nature of reality. We're fixated on one particular hypothesis – one particular state of mind.

Generally, when we contemplate abstract ideas, we do so with a level of non-commitment. So, I might contemplate what it would be like to believe in the Christian god, or what it would be like to believe in fairies, but I usually maintain a certain sort of personal distance from that contemplation. However, what happens when we contemplate with a level of commitment?

I could select one abstract belief and focus on what it is like to believe it – say, Christianity. As time moves on, I would become skilled and accustomed to focusing on this new belief. This would give me the opportunity to explore the realm of possible beliefs within this primary belief. So, then I could contemplate what it would be like to believe in an immanent rapture v. believing Christ won't return for thousands of years. I could further commit to contemplating one of these beliefs and gradually get more and more specific and concrete. Eventually, I could reach a point where I was contemplating what it would be like to experience a world as a Christian believing in an immanent rapture, who wants to start a Christian family, who has a male body and lives in America...etc. At that point, I could be vividly imagining the life of such a being from their POV and having concrete experiences of their life. The focus of my contemplation could become how to succeed in living that kind of life. Questions like “how do I get a good career?” or “how do I impress pretty Christian girls?” might be what I spend most of my time thinking about.

In such a state of focus, I might forget that all of my most abstract beliefs about that imaginary world are hypothetical. The more I focus on the details of living that life, the less I will focus on the hypothetical nature of that life. As I become emotionally invested in my imaginary world, I might begin to fear losing my hypothetical job or upsetting my hypothetical wife or the death of my hypothetical body.

This state of focus on the concrete details of a hypothetical life is exactly the situation you are in now. This is the hypothetical nature of the world. This is synonymous with the idea that everything is a dream. Becoming lucid in the waking dream is the same as becoming aware of the hypothetical beliefs you've assumed and becoming aware of your fundamental nature as a being that contemplates hypothetical realities, and learning to use that knowledge.

Reality is a contemplation of the hypothetical.

Utthana - Attributions & Points-of-View

Look around you for a while. Really get a good sense of where you are and how you feel right now. Take a few minutes to do that.

... ...

Good? Alright. Now, try creating a division between two distinct types of experience you're having: **"perceptions" and "attributions".** Notice the difference between the visual keyboard you're perceiving and your concept of "what a keyboard is". To help you get a grasp of the difference between the perception and the attribution, try changing your attribution. Think about your keyboard as the instrument that it is. Then think about it for the block of atoms/matter that it is. Then think about it as the visual stimulation of 2d colors in your eyes that it is. Then think about it as the geometrical object in space that it is. Then think about it as the extension of yourself that it is. Note these different "ways of thinking about" the perception, and how they differ from the perception itself. Notice how much easier is it to play with these "ways of thinking about" than it is to play with the direct perception itself.

Try doing this with more complex, nuanced things. Look at your neighbor not as, for example, "Jeff the guy", but as the hairless and upright homo Sapien, as the geometric object in space, as the sack of meat and flesh, as the conscious being with experiences and perceptions, as the child that grew up into an adult, as the background character in your solipsistic world, etc.

Now, take note that one of these was your "default", while the others required an active consideration on your part. If you'd just stumbled out of bed and saw your keyboard, or saw your neighbor, you'd be "subconsciously" using one of these default attributions.** In fact, nearly everything you interact with is conceptualized in merely one way of many possible ways, and your current defaults can be changed if you'd like to change them.** If "Jeff the guy" is annoying to you, "Jeff the kid who grew up into a confused and sad man" might be less annoying, or if your keyboard seems crude and mechanical, thinking of it as a physical object of color and shape may make it less abrasive. This type of practice is not limited to just people or objects. This can be extended in any direction you like. If you can conceive of it, this practice is applicable to it. None of your defaults are inflexible.

Your "default" is not very different from the defaults of most people. Collectively, we share a lot of default ways of conceptualizing things. These are "cultures". Cultures are collected, habitual, often subconscious ways of conceptualizing our perceptions. If you feel your default way of conceptualizing things is shitty or non-ideal, then you can break away from your cultural habits. Personally, I think my (our?) culture has a lot of shitty habits both minor and major. For example, minorly, I think our cultural attitude toward food is pretty lame, and that we could be handling food in a much better way. Majorly, I think each of us has a tremendous potential for power and influence over our own state of being, but our culture conceptualizes lots and lots of "external" things as having power of us, and by assuming they have that power, we grant them that power.

This is kind of like being Harry Potter, and the invitations to Hogwarts are arriving in the mail, but instead of bolting up the mailbox, Uncle Dursley has taught the whole family that envelopes will burn you if you touch

them, and so nobody ever touches an envelope, and if they did, they probably would genuinely think they were being burned.

Alternatively, you can try to be "culturally open". In other words, question your habits and tendencies and *play with* your habits and tendencies. See if you can't change your defaults. See if you can't start to love something you used to hate, or see if you can't find depth to appreciate in something you'd only understood superficially. You can also do these things in the opposite way (e.g. hate something you once loved) and while it's less fun and less encouraging, knowing that you can do that and being able to do that is important if you prioritize flexibility.

Of all the things one can shift one's default attributions toward/about, the one I've found to be the most interesting is the way one relates to other living things. You're currently experiencing reality/yourself as a being within a world. This is probably not a very unusual mode of experience. We can imagine experiencing merely a volitional being, and we can imagine experiencing merely a non-volitional world, but between those extremes there seems to be a "bigger infinity" of potential experiences that involve both a volitional entity and a non-volitional world. Taking the POV of a being or entity appears to be a common perspective (at least from where I stand).

While "you" are *not* a human, which is to say your capacity is not constricted to only being a human, you can (and, I think, should) dwell on the fact that you *are currently experiencing a human point of view (POV).* You're currently "humaning". And your spectrum of experience is that of the particular human you're experiencing "yourself as". So, while I'm =/= Utthana, the current perspective I'm taking is Utthana's perspective (although I do sometimes take others). And just so, other living things are unique in that they exist within our perspective *as* other perspectives themselves. For example, TGeorge exists within my POV, but he exists *as a potential POV himself* within my POV.

This means that there's "a way it's like to be" TGeorge. You can meaningfully say, "This is *what it's like to be* a cat," whereas you can't say, "this is what it's like to be a chair". We can readily imagine experiencing ourselves from the POV of a cat or from the POV of TGeorge, in a way that we can't readily imagine ourselves as experiencing ourselves from the POV of a chair (as conventionally understood – we can imagine something that looks like a chair which could have a POV).

Being mindful of this, to me, is super useful and enjoyable. I like recognizing other POV's within my POV because my default is often to objectify people and the really inflate my own POV. I don't tend to see other beings as full and as nuanced as myself, but Utthana the human and TGeorge the human are both equal POV's that I could take. So I like taking this perspectives (sometimes, and not always), because it allows me to:

1) Empathize. All POV's are POV's that I could theoretically take. I'm the capacity to take perspectives, not a specific point of view myself. "That could be me," is applicable to everyone I encounter. I like to play with my default conceptualization of other beings in such a way that I'm inclined to have empathy for them. I currently am interested in playing a role of someone who is relatively non-aggressive, non-competitive, helpful, and kind. To further my interest in playing that particular game, I make things easier for myself by changing the way I look at difficult people (some of the time).

2) Be aware of the glaring subjectivity of my own POV. By regularly acknowledging and appreciating other potential perspectives, you come to appreciate your own perspective in light of others. You become aware of all the possible perspectives you could take. I especially like dwelling on plants, because plants have a

potential perspective and POV, but it's radically different from that of animals and helps to demonstrate just how alien our perspectives can potentially be (which in turn highlights the potential weirdness and alienness of our current, default POV).

3) Change my attributions more easily. Seeing my default perspective as just one among many helps make it seem less "front and center", less dominant, less immovable. For example, I currently look out my window and see trees, grass, etc. They look kind of dark and I conceptualize them in a slightly negative way. They don't seem as positive as grass and trees in brighter lighting. Understanding that my default perspective is just one of many possible perspectives, I can decide to see the dim lighting as beautiful and cinematic, I can decide to see the grass and trees as miraculous shapes that grew from the ground, I can decide to see them as distinct entities with experiences and perspectives, or I can even decide to (and this is a step further, altering perception instead of attribution) see something entirely else outside of my window, like the Eiffel Tower. Asserting a new attribution or perception may, at first, feel like it's "only happening in your mind" or "imaginary". Further weakening your sense of your default POV as privileged (as well as further contemplating subjective idealism in general) will make "imaginary" seem a lot less imaginary and "only happening in your mind" seem like an arbitrary description.

I recommend you experiment with different conceptual attributions for your perceptions. Don't think that your perceptions can only be conceptualized in one way. **You don't have to learn how to do magic and directly change the "physical" world around you in order to radically change your experience in ways that make you happier and help you do things you'd like to do.** You have tons and tons and tons of default, subconscious attributions to your perceptions and every single one of them can be played with. This whole thing is malleable. And even the "anchor" of your attributions and perceptions, your particular "POV as a being", is merely one potential POV and you can play with that as well. Start small, work your way up, and try not to be discouraged by any tendencies to dismiss things as "imaginary" or "all in your head".

mindseal - Playfulness.

There is something I realized relatively recently. It happened after I joined /r/occult, which is a subreddit dedicated to practicing magick, among other topics. I've always been keen on the idea of magick, but I never really did much of anything with it for the most part. I just thought it was a cool idea, and I thought it's definitely possible and it fits into my worldview. For a long time I didn't go anywhere with it beyond that.

There was this really stunning thing that happened when I first attempted to manipulate my waking phenomenal reality. This really blew my mind. It was a realization of how much I **don't** allow my intent to flow in that sort of direction! In other words, just one act of trying to tinker with something in my world highlighted how seriously I was relating to all the phenomena. I was such a bore! That one act of meddling highlighted the *massive* energy of *non-meddling* that completely dominated my inner life. I was faced with a thought that I had an option. I could have been relating to everything a lot more playfully and a lot less seriously, and I wasn't doing it at all.

Around the same time, a little bit before, I also read a stunning post on /r/psychonaut by someone who seems not to post anything there. It was like this person just showed up, made this one post, and disappeared into the ether. But I never forgot it. The post was about playfully fooling around with the perceptions we experience in day to day life. At first I thought the post can't be serious. Everything the post was talking about seemed so superficial, and also, so easy to do. And at the time I didn't instantly understand the point of it. I knew it was important *somehow* and so I remembered the general idea. But then I started to appreciate how it's this very playfulness that was important, and how it was actually a very good thing that the entry into playfulness was so easy and simple. The importance of all this dawned on me vividly when I tried to do some magick for the first time, after hanging out on /r/occult. It was when I realized I was such a fuddy duddy bore.

Imagine as you walk around, you touch trees with your imaginary hands. Imagine how you slightly change the tint of the colors of everything you see. Imagine a big giant bowl of colored popcorn spilling all over the street. Imagine yourself growing a bit taller, and then a bit shorter. Imagine smelling incense as you walk. Imagine hearing a rhythmical drum beat or a chant.

I realized I could enrich, bend, warp, and generally mess around with my experience *at all times*. I also realized it's actually a very good thing to do repeatedly and often, to cultivate it as a kind of playful attitude toward one's own experience. It's a way to take the things one experiences during waking less seriously. So as I walk around, I can sometimes see a giant eye looking at me from the center of the Earth. Or I may see infinitely long thick beams of light piercing everything and rotating. I'd imagine a swirling stream of As, like the letter "A", lots of them, swirling around like bees, flying around, filling up my body, circling around, then flying out into the world and swarming there. I can imagine my feet stomping the ground like drum beats even though I don't stomp and just walk normally.

It's like suddenly my imagination is alive and active, and it's present to my mind and is mixing with the "non-imaginary" scenery of the waking experience. It's very interesting how it feels. It's possible to play with one's experience in so many ways. One could try to stretch and compress time. It's not necessary to do anything huge. In the beginning the tiniest alterations are enough. The whole point is to drop the serious attitude. The waking experience is just a plaything, and we can play with it.

Utthana - Mindfulness as an Essential Practice

What is the goal? To escape mental habits and tendencies which have become excessively ingrained and therefore mistaken as aspects of reality as opposed to modes of perception. The goal is to be open to all possible perspectives and experiences including those radically different from the ordinary human experience.

The goal is to cease to be a human? You've never been a human. The goal is to cease believing that you are a human.

Why is it preferable to cease believing you are a human? Firstly, because it is incorrect. Secondly, because the human body is limited. It will suffer, age, and then die. You will undergo all of these experiences and they will be painful, unless you realize that they are not *happening to you*, you are merely *experiencing their happening*. It is essential to come to hold the right view about the nature of your experiences.

What is the right view? The right view is to understand one's experiences exactly as they are, to penetrate their nature. Right view is to perceive the physical world as a dream, a fabrication, an illusion, not ultimately real. This means one drops the beliefs they hold in normal, waking life about the nature of their experiences (i.e. as happening in a real, physical, external world) and adopts another. Right view is distinct from wrong view, or the conventional human mode of consciousness, in the same way that a painter presented with an apple would react differently (on instinct, immediately, without contemplation) than a starving man: phenomena are perceived in an entirely different way, despite being, superficially, the same phenomena. Right view is when the understanding of subjective idealism is *consciously evident* in the nature of one's experiences. This is the difference between understanding "I'm typing on my keyboard right now" and "I'm experiencing Utthana typing on his keyboard right now" and having such an understanding *as it is happening*.

That's a nice concept in theory, but maintaining that mode of experiencing all day is an act of meditative endeavor. How is this achievable? It's true that this is to be attained through right mindfulness, or right meditation, which is an endeavor. But constant endeavor is necessary to be ultimately flexible.

Wait, why is it desirable to be ultimately flexible? One who is flexible, adaptable, and comfortable with all experiences is immortal, invulnerable, and infinitely powerful. One who is ultimately flexible is one who is open to all possible experiences.

This now seems even more daunting! The ability to instantly, attentively, alertly, and consciously respond to each experience individually and uniquely is what it is to be enlightened. This requires a mind ("The Beginner's Mind") which is open, unattached, and pliable, accommodating to every farthest reach of conceivable experience. The mind must not be dull, unaware, lost in thought, lost in action, "being human", full absorbed in the physical world and taking it to be real, in a "normal state".

What does this have to do with mindfulness or meditation? Only when one is attentive to every possible type of experience can one be expected to react to, and respond to, each with the full alertness, attention, and conscious awareness to be ultimately flexible. If you are not aware of each experience you are having as it is, you will never be able to respond to each skillfully and with an open heart. You will, instead, fall back into old patterns and default, human ways of perceiving things (i.e. physicalism).

So how is this to be achieved? Only by being constantly vigilant can this be achieved. One must arouse one's self to full attention of the experience that one is undergoing according to the Right View. This is the difference between being able to say, "I just walked across the room," and having been intensely aware of the fact that you were experiencing yourself walking across the room during each instant of your walking.

This still sounds like a strenuous meditative endeavor. Am I expected to be completely alert to my experiences all day and every day? Yes. The normal, waking mode of consciousness is when one is capable of discussing subjective idealism theoretically but, for fifteen hours a day, experiences itself as human, busy with tasks, mind not fully aware of the nature of one's experiences but instead lost in interaction, conversation, and the physical world. The mode of consciousness that is desired is when one is, instead, constantly aware and alert to the nature of their experiences, ultimately flexible, not lost in thought or busy with tasks, not experiencing itself as human. Every minute, every hour, every day, every lifetime not spent completely alert and attentive is a minute, hour, day, or lifetime spent ingraining conventional habits.

Is the maintenance of such a state not exhausting? No. The samsaric state of being lost in ordinary thoughts is where we are comfortable, and it is a strain and difficulty to become constantly aware and alert. But this is not a perpetual endeavor, like a mental task of thinking of the same mantra over and over, day in and day out forever. This is a shift from one natural resting place for the mind to another. Once one "gets into the habit" of perceiving reality with full attention and awareness and not allowing the mind to get lost, remaining in such a state becomes as natural as remaining in the normal, waking mode of consciousness is to us now. The alert, awake mode of consciousness can become how one wakes up, the mode one defaults to in events of trial and trauma (including death), and even how one dreams.

Never mind maintaining it, how does one initially get into such a state, or return to such a state after one has relapsed to the normal, physicalist perception? There are many ways. Intense and prolonged contemplation on right view is often sufficient to induce the shift in the character of experiences, but the practice is not entirely 'passive'. Meditation or drugs, when done by one who has firmly grasped the right view, can induce this shift. Active and intentional magickal practices can be exceptionally powerful tools as well. But the real trial lies in the maintenance of right view and right mindfulness throughout all of life. The difference between one who theoretically understands wisdom for a few hours of the day, and one who lives with wisdom even in their dreams, is the effort undertaken to maintain that state of consciousness. *Being intensely aware of one's experiences exactly as they are happening, in the context of a latent understanding of right view (subjective idealism), and maintaining such a state, is all that is necessary.*

Utthana - How's the water?

Imagine you go to bed tonight, and each night after, and enter into the same, continuous, cohesive, coherent dream world. It remains as apparently constant, unchanging, and "objective" as our own waking world does. In other words, you're living in two consistent worlds which you alternate experiencing (as opposed to one consistent world + lots of less consistent, less predictable worlds). In this dream world, you're aware that you're dreaming, and that when you go to bed in the dream world, you'll wake up in the "real" world. The other folks in the dream world, though, are exactly like the folks in the waking world. In fact, the so-called-"dream world" and the so-called-"waking world" are just about identical. You experience both as a fleshy being living on a planet, eating, sleeping, communicating, laboring, playing, etc. You're Bob the Human on Earth half the time and you're Flob the Fluman on Flearth the other half of the time. In fact, if it weren't for the fact that you didn't start dreaming about Flearth until now, you'd probably not know which one was "real"!

Question: What kind of lifestyle do you adopt on Flearth, where you know you're dreaming? Do you watch Flearth TV shows, go to a mundane Flearth job, pay your Flearth bills, fill up Flearth trash cans, buy Flearth products in Flearth Flal-Marts, eat Flearth animals, etc.? Do you spend your time on Flearth doing about 90% the same thing as everyone else on Flearth? Or, maybe, do you try to solve world hunger, end wars, spread peace, etc.? Or, maybe, do you become a genocidal warlord? Prime minister? Sports star? Ascetic? Billionaire?

I pose this hypothetical because I want to know to what degree you put your money where your mouth is. If you really do experience the Earth, with all its capitalism, warfare, environmental destruction, overpopulation, etc. as a dream world, how does that influence the way you interact with it? Are you more, or less, compelled to help other people/civilization and society as a whole? What does that do to your ambitions and aspirations? Because there certainly does seem to be -something of a contradiction (and that may be a strong word) in living a totally mundane and ordinary life, nearly entirely identical to that of any conventional physicalist, if you're awake to the fact that it's all a dream. (There are some metaphysical arguments against this which are perfectly valid, but I've got that gut feeling and I'm standing by it.)

We talk a lot about contemplating, metaphysics, and dealing with very specific situations on this sub, but very little about the things that we likely spend the vast majority of our human lives doing. How does subjective idealism influence your life choices? What obligations do you feel toward being a human, other humans, human society, etc.? Do you have animosity toward mainstream culture or do you enjoy it? Are you all logging out of Reddit and turning on reality TV, or are you sitting in fallout shelters in the dark all night?

It's not unlike that famous story from David Foster Wallace where the two fish are swimming along and an older, wiser swims by and says, "Hey boys, how's the water?" And after a while, one of the two younger fish turns to the other and asks, "What the hell' 'water'?" As oneirosophers, in theory, you're aware that THIS IS WATER. So, I'm literally asking you, "*How* is it?"

At the end of the day, this is your playground, right? I mean, this is basically here for you to play in (with the implications of play/fun not being limited to sheer pleasure). It's game-like in nature. Are you treating it that way? If not, why not? *Are* you having fun? Does this life feel playful? Is there any gap between what you "feel like you should be doing" and what you are doing, day in and day out? Are you happy with this current life experience?

AesirAnatman - A Perspective on Will: Imagination and Magic

What is the imagination? The imagination is your power to create and explore perspectives. There are the more conscious, surface levels of your imagination, such as those where you can close your eyes and manifest whatever you would like immediately. There are the middling levels of your imagination, such as those where you manifest aspects of your human life (such as job, home, relationships, interests, etc.) that you can change, but perhaps not so immediately or easily as your sandbox imagination. And there are the more subconscious, deep levels of your imagination, such as those where you manifest the vast world you experience as stable and continuous, and everyone and everything in it: those that seem entrenched and quite formidable to someone just gaining an understanding of Subjective Idealism.

The deeper some tendency to manifest is buried in your imagination, in your mind, the more it operates on its own and seems to be out of your conscious control: the more it is subconscious and othered. The more a tendency to manifest has been unearthed, the more conscious it becomes: the more it is selfed. A conventional person is someone who has buried their tendencies to imagine this reality so deeply that they have forgotten their own subconscious responsibility for those tendencies. Now they call those tendencies other. External. Matter.

Most of you interested in Subjective Idealism here in this space are coming out of a long and dark materialist, objectivist, externalist stupor. I know I certainly am. Almost the entirety of your intent is probably buried in the deepest dungeons of your imagination – caged due to aeons of self-forgetfulness. It's probable that your project is similar to mine. Dig up most of that intent, examine it, refashion it, bury some of it deep but not nearly as deep as before, keep other aspects of it much closer to the surface, much more readily accessible to the conscious part of the mind.

So, assuming you've got some idea of what you want to adjust and what you want to leave alone, how do you unearth and bury parts of your imagination, your will? Well, isn't it obvious? You use your imagination, your will! Your waking reality is your imagination, habituated at the deepest levels. Practiced for countless lifetimes. You need to start practicing, to start imagining, to start willing, whatever new perspective, whatever new intent, you'd like to manifest.

There's an important caveat to this. Your sense of self is likely rather small. It would be rather difficult to suddenly honestly and truly exercise a sense of self on the scale of a god with divine powers and all after humaning for so many lifetimes. For most people, it's probably better to take a gradual approach to expanding your sense of self. If you can't manage to calm yourself when you get angry, or eat your vegetables for health when you don't like the taste as much (I don't mean to imply that you ought to do these things, only that you ought to be *able* to do these things), then you'll likely not learn magical healing or wisdom, let alone something like telekinesis. Start where you are. If you begin by learning to do things that are slightly difficult, you will eventually be able to easily do what once seemed quite difficult or improbable, and one day you will be able to accomplish the impossible.

The more you adopt the Subjective Idealist mindset, and the more confidence you develop in yourself, the more you will find yourself considering turning to magic to accomplish things in your life instead of the

conventional paths of negotiating with others and manipulating matter with your body. What is magic, according to Subjective Idealism? It's the alteration of your will, your imagination, often understood as acts that we would conventionally consider impossible. But really even opening and closing your hand is an act of magic. As is the daily maintenance of the waking world.

The ability to magically change something is easier when that something is closer to consciousness and more difficult when it is more subconscious. So, to get good at a given form of magic I suggest two things: (a) pay attention to your mind and learn your tendencies in the domain that you are wanting to master and (b) start practicing. Imagine that something in the domain you want to learn that you wish to accomplish is realized. Yes, in your sandbox imagination, but as soon as possible try to put that imagination, that belief, right onto the waking world as well. See what it feels like. Find out what sorts of ideas you have in your mind that resist it, that fight back, that reject it and dismiss it. These are all your buried, subconscious habits of mind within your imagination. Don't be hasty. Examine the resistance. Be certain you are willing to give up the limiting belief before you abandon it – consider its advantages, not just its disadvantages. There's a reason you originally established this tendency. Then, if you've decided, abandon it. And if it ever rises again, each time crush it and imagine your new vision, your new magic. It will always take hold *eventually* if you have the commitment to stick it out. Always.

If you do this, you will gradually unearth the depths of your imagination and your magical power will grow in the newly tilled soil of your mind.

[...]

> [**A**: I'm playing with the idea that desire is automatic. So once you desire something there is nothing you need to push against or force since that unintentionally implies that there's some difficulty or hurdle that needs to be overcome, when there doesn't need to be. It's like an instant release of any preconceived patterns and the allowing of desire to manifest unhindered, by trusting the process.]

This is definitely a way you could manage manifestation. I'm wary of it because sometimes I get really into the heat of the moment and want something major changed really bad, only to find later that I'm glad I didn't have my immediate wish. So I think there can be some benefit to having parts of the world buried deeper in the subconscious where you can't touch them as quickly or easily too. Really it's a matter of taste and preference. What you're suggesting here, having the whole world right on the edge of consciousness, could be an interesting experience in itself.

BraverNewerWorld - Resting in Yourself

I battle with tiredness quite a lot. I've been asking myself where the fatigue is coming from recently, in an effort to alleviate it. The main factor I've identified involves the permanent tension that exists between the "you" who you feel you are and the "you" you manifest.

There's nothing startling or supernatural in this of course - feeling pressure to act a certain way in defiance of your true feelings is pretty universal. I think that once you start to veer away from physicalism, though, there's a greater disparity between "internal" you and "external" you.

At any rate, having identified this as a big mental energy suck, I'm now trying to behave in a way that feels more consistent with my internal vision of myself/the world.

In this respect, the tiredness has almost become a pointer - whatever I'm confronted with, there's a course of action, or a way of thinking, or a way of being that I feel I can "rest with" internally. That's the best that I can describe it. I'd describe the opposite feeling as a mixture of debilitation and demotivation. Considering the difficulties associated with knowing one's own mind and desires, it's a useful tool to have.

Having decided on whatever path or action I can "rest with", the next step is obviously following through, and this brings its own, different tensions. I think worrying about your public persona is one of the hardest physicalist hang-ups to shake, and, as a subjective idealist, some of the courses of action that feel "restful" to me look crazy to an average person. So there's that to battle, but I'd still say that the fatigue that comes with fighting the stress of worrying whether you look like a crazy person is preferable to the deep internal exhaustion that comes from trying to smother your ideal self.

The other reason it's exhausting is because it runs you up against the apparent physical world. Sometimes the restful path is "look different," "stop being cold," etc. But it's not a bad thing, I think, for these thoughts to become reflexive, and to replace the current reflex, which goes something like:

- dissatisfying experience
- "What a pity change is impossible."
- "Wait, maybe **it isn't impossible!"**

[...]

[[**Utthana:** This is a great post IMO. Simple but crucial. I do slightly disagree with its conclusion, but I'll get there in a moment. If I'm reading it with the intention with which it was written, it gets at a point covered (in fewer words) in the Dao De Jing: *"Colors blind the eye; sounds deafen the ear; flavors numb the taste; thoughts weaken the mind; desires wither the heart."*

The sensory experience will gladly remain on autopilot. It doesn't require anything of you. You can go on talking and eating and thinking without giving it a moment's consideration. I'll sometimes experience whole days before I realize - I haven't consented to any of this at all! I've just allowed it to happen! How can it be a wonder if I have tension or anxiety if I haven't even attempted to oversee my own actions?

Better to make conscious, deliberate decisions. Better to, with self-awareness and presence, be decisive and discerning. Like a wild animal, you can tame your habits, reprogramming the autopilot. Slowly it becomes less likely to lead you down weird directions. That seems to be your advice and conclusion. Which is accurate and

I agree. Nevertheless, I want to clarify that even if your autopilot is very clever, it has an endless capacity for running astray, and every time some new idea or experience enters in, you shouldn't just rely on a well-trained autopilot to handle that. Developing restful paths is not quite a replacement for diligent mindfulness. But it's certainly a great tool in the arsenal of the imperfect practitioner.]]

AesirAnatman - Experiences as Action

This is really a simple one I've been playing with lately. Mostly it's obvious if you've been around here long. But all reality and all potential realities are imaginary aspects of your mind. Imaginary here means something like intentional and inside your mind.

Sometimes we talk about experiences feeling non-volitional - the sensory manifestations we associate with 'the external world'. That feeling of not being under control is fundamentally confused though. It's as if one were playing a game of Solitaire. In the game, there are certain rules that constrain your behavior to very specific actions. When you get to the bottom of the deck you shuffle the cards left and go through them again. OR. If a queen is moved onto a king in another stack, you must move all the cards that were on top of the queen with it. These are what we might call environmental rules. They are actions you must take under certain conditions in order to properly play the game of Solitaire. In contrast to these are what we might call bodily rules - the parts of the game over which you exercise free choice within the limits of the game to try to achieve your goal. You may either move an appropriate card from the bottom stacks or deck card to the suits stacks or you may flip another deck card or you may move cards on one bottom stack to another bottom stack. The analogy works best if you imagine that you've deeply habituated the rules of the game such that you pay very little attention to what you are doing with the 'environmental rules' and focus very much on the 'bodily rules' and the choices of action you limit yourself to in the game.

Using the same language we use about our sensory world we could say that the habituated environmental rules seem out of our power. But that's not quite right because they are quite within your power. "But," you might say, "I really want to get that buried card there into the proper suit stack so I might win the game. If I really had the power I could just move it there, but I can't." Of course you can though. You don't really HAVE to follow the rules of Solitaire when you interact with the cards, you know? You CAN just put it there if you want to cheat. Or you could scrap the whole thing and play a totally different game. And deep down of course you know this. The thing is you're not sure. You kinda like this Solitaire game at some level even if you're frustrated with it too. You'd have to be quite sure you didn't want to try to salvage this game from this vantage point before cheating, and you'd have to be quite sure you were sick of Solitaire overall before switching to another game.

So what is it about humaning, even with all of its obstacles and frustrations, that you like so much? What keeps you doing it instead of anything else lifetime after lifetime? What have you considered doing instead? Are you just looking for a quick hack to have a better vantage point while humaning or do you want to play a different game altogether? Do you know?

I know these are questions I've been asking myself a lot lately.

[...]

> A: Ah, so you're the one I'm supposed to high-five. Where should we meet, I'm tired of humaning.

BraverNewerWorld - The Wandering Self

Hello friends. I hope you're all well and making progress in your chosen paths, wherever you happen to be wandering.

It sure did get deathly quiet around here - I feel like everyone sank into solitary contemplation at around the same time. But a pandemic is as good an excuse as any to touch base and see how everyone's going. I don't have anything groundbreaking to share so I thought I'd do a quick where I'm at post. I'd love to hear where you're at as well.

For my own part - I finally acknowledged to myself that the pursuit of wisdom, knowledge and power is the abiding and sole focus of my life, and has been, really, from as early as I can remember. I relieved myself of a lot of unnecessary guilt in coming to terms with this. It's not that I don't care about other things, or other people - but I perceive them differently now, as fitting within the framework of my pursuit, not in competition with it. They're sub-headings, not a whole different essay. To this end, I made a lot of changes, rearranging things so that contemplation and practice were at the centre of my life. What did this achieve?

Well. Lol. Things never move as fast as I want them to.

I'm always engaged in "kicking the walls of reality," so to speak. I feel like this is less skilful practice and more frustration-driven destruction - but seeing the occasional crack appear in the plaster of our physical experience is satisfying! Even if it doesn't happen nearly enough. Some strange things happened. I saw what I can only describe as a "cloaked" spider walking across the ceiling of my house one day, only to have it disappear when I got up and examined it closely. A bunch of standard "haunted house" stuff started happening around me - being held down in bed while wide awake, doors opening of their own volition, yadda yadda.

None of it was frightening nor, I think, particularly meaningful (well... the spider DOES make me stop and think from time to time). Basically if you randomly kick walls you're going to randomly cause destruction and that's probably all there is to say about that - but I mention it because it's mildly interesting.

Contemplation-wise, the nature of self, personality and identity continues to hold my attention. I had a lucid dream recently - one of those gift from the gods types, where I hadn't even been trying to LD but wham! There I was, with a high degree of lucidity.

In this dream I was fully aware of this life, of the body in the bed dreaming the encounter. What made this LD novel for me though was the sense that I was emotionally attached to and detached from that dreamer's life at one and the same time. I wasn't quite occupying the position of omniscience and omnipotence that I aim for, but I was in a "higher" state than in waking life because I had more choices. The emotional attachments and things I find important in this life felt real and vital but they did **not** feel urgent. There are other dreams - infinite other dreams - with attachments and concerns of their own and there is time (or no time) for all of them. It was nice to experience, if only for a brief moment, something that we theorise about a lot here. It's a good state, I now know, to inhabit. Worth striving for.

Worthiness continues to plague me. This is an unhealthy recurrent pattern for me. u/mindseal has a great post somewhere here about the trap of feeling as if you have to gain confidence through overcoming challenges.

Right now I'm stuck between knowing this is true and *knowing* this is true. If anyone has tips or tricks they've used to tackle this particular hurdle, feel free to send 'em my way!

Other than that - over to you guys. I hope your travels have brought you something you think worth sharing!

[...]

> [[**syncretik**: From my experience emotions tend to create hurdles with overcoming challenges or achieving goals. They don't *have* to of course, this is a limitation you set up in your mind and it's a prevalent limitation among people. But through this one perspective, I've had most of my breakthroughs and insights through emotional releasing and letting go of yearning for desires. When you *know* something is true you don't go searching for it because it's right here and now, so you have to realize that you're already whole and perfect and complete as you are now. It's the counter-intiutive riddle of humanity. Do you feel whole and complete now, or do you need to achieve that goal to feel whole and complete? Do you sit and enjoy your desires, or can you not enjoy them until you first get on the rollercoaster that brings you back here?
>
> You might sit and appreciate your desires and be content with that, or your appreciation might lead you to taking some kind of further contemplation or action to seal the deal. It depends on what kind of dream you want to have.]]
>
> [[**Oracle010**: “Riddle of humanity” is very well put. I was thinking along the same lines as this. Most major things have come unexpectedly after I’ve given up, or moved on from them, or already resolved them. Which makes me realize I spend most of my time desiring, “incomplete”, reaching out or yearning for something. Unfortunately, I still haven’t found a good way to make use of this. It can’t really be done on purpose. So, how to get those experiences you want? I think this idea makes a good operational principle for why something Goddard-esque might work. You are taking that which makes you reach out, makes you incomplete - your desire, and bringing it here and now, returning yourself to completeness. While specifically targeting what you want. Something along these lines might be functional. Separately, are you saying to simply enjoy having your desires? I’ve always liked the idea of that, but thought I wasn’t being “productive”. Though I spend a lot of time day dreaming, and those things never really show up either.]]
>
> [[**syncretik:** Yes, enjoy having the desires and enjoy watching them come to fruition. You don't want to judge your life according to how many desires you can manifest, but rather find contentment first so that you're kind of nonchalant about *needing* these desires to manifest (but it's nice if they do). This is where the "counter-intuitive riddle" comes in (it's not really counter-intuitive but seems so), you shouldn't rely on desires to manifest in order to be happy because that creates suffering and suffering leads to less fruition and more suffering.]]

BraverNewerWorld - Claiming ownership

This is a technique/mindset I've been playing with recently in an effort to reduce the degree of othering in my experience.

I realised that I have a tendency to mentally claim ownership of anything that occurs in my life that I subjectively view as good or desirable. So if I'm driving to an appointment, I get there and there's lots of parking available - that's because I've been consciously intending punctuality. On the other hand, if I hit roadworks and arrive to find a packed carpark - in my mind, that's because I've been consciously intending punctuality but have failed for some reason.

So now, in an effort to narrow the gap between what I'm consciously intending and subconsciously intending, I'm getting into the habit of taking credit for everything. The wind blows - I think "I did that." I arrive to a full carpark and end up being late, I think "Not sure why I did that, but I did that."

Sometimes, particularly when the thing I'm taking credit for is subjectively negative, I take credit and then try to backtrack to figure out why I might have done such a thing. Sometimes I arrive at an answer, sometimes I don't. Either way, I remind myself that it was me who did it, even if it was stupid.

As far as claiming ownership of the things that are neither here nor there - the wind blowing, the colour of the car that's driving beside me, the appearance of the girl who sold me milk - I've found that getting into the habit of automatically, effortlessly claiming ownership for these things is a very effective means of getting into an altered, dreamlike state. A few times, I've experienced the sensation that I am truly catching the moment/feeling of when "subconscious/other me" decided to make the wind blow. A couple of times now I've been able to "see" the way that something would pan out, like the path a leaf would take as it drifted to the ground.

[...]

> **AesirAnatman**: This is excellent as were your other posts. Thanks for sharing your ideas here. I think it's interesting to focus on becoming very familiar with and conscious of what you are manifesting habitually and less consciously as you are advocating here. Very powerful. Especially as a big reminder of the nature of reality. WAIT, you mean I really am doing all of this!?

mindseal – Positive intent.

It is sometimes said that we want to prolong the pleasant situations and to avoid the unpleasant. It's very tempting to mentally swat at the unpleasant situations or experiences as they arise. I don't hold any extreme views in this regard, but I do think some caution here is a good idea.The problem that can happen is that once you swat at the bad thing and let's say you get rid of it, you're still left believing that the thing you just swatted at is something that can sometimes happen, and maybe even should, which isn't always a good thing.

So for example, this body of mine had zits for a while, and it seemed like the more I was popping them, the more they appeared. It was as though my body was saying, "You seem to enjoy popping those things, so here are some more then." I've had much fewer problems once I started thinking that I have healthy skin, no matter what it looks like, and minimized any popping. Now I hardly have any zits at all.

Let's say there is situation I do not want. It's tempting to only focus on removing it. But it's at least as important to focus on a situation that I *do* want, a kind of good situation which simply leaves no room for the situation I don't want. The reason for this is that the othered side of mind can be really arbitrary. Once I had a dream where as far as I could see, up to infinity, I saw these hideous locusts everywhere. This is a clue. The mind has no limit in terms of imagining obstacles. I really realized something in that dream. Normally my instinct would be to swat at the locust. This is fine if there is only one or two. OK, but I am studious and stubborn, so I can swat even 10 thousand. *But what if it's endless?* What if it's a self-sustaining process? Doh. Then obviously I have to think differently.

In a way the subconscious mind is sometimes trolling me. If I am dealing with an opponent who is *not* playing fair, I cannot win in a fair contest. So an infinity of locusts is not a fair and sporting opponent. Competing with them using some sports-like notions makes no sense. The only workable option is to be unfair myself, such as, denying them reality in a summary way, mentally. And, imagining green hills with some trees is more important than imagining how to get rid of locusts, especially if there is an infinite number of them. If it's just one, I think it's OK to imagine how to get rid of it, but if I sense it's going to become a recurring pattern, I have to take a different approach to manifestation than to swat at the bad experience or scenario.

That's also why when healing, it's very important to sense health right inside the sick area, as much as possible, in addition to whatever visualization one might use to clean the bad condition out. So if you visualize the bad stuff as a black smoke and you see it leaving the body, that's OK, but just as important, I think, is to focus on the good right in the middle of the "bad." It can be challenging to sense pain-free goodness and health right inside something that hurts and looks swollen, but this is highly effective in my experience.

Some challenges are enjoyable. But it's also possible to face an unwinnable challenge, and if that's the case, there is no need to play fair. And winnable challenges can sometimes become unwinnable if we swat at them too recklessly and/or with too little wisdom. So I'm not against mental negations, but I do see a case where negations can sometimes escalate into something that's hard to manage by the ever more copious negations.

[...]

> A: And of course, it often -is- endless, even when it doesn't look like it superficially. Even when it seems like, "Oh, this is just a stray incident." The perpetuation of suffering that's chased away

> can happen very much below-the-surface and its manifestations don't always look the same. These things are complicated, with limbs in lots of directions. If you're got a grasp on banishing simple things and you find it's not working for some particular nuisance, that nuisance is probably a hydra head. You need to look deeper.

I very much agree. Often "deeper" means "scarier" too. It may be something I don't want to look at. That said, I still think some negations are OK, and maybe even some suffering too. I just want my suffering to mean something and not to be too onerous. If I start feeling like I'm suffering mindlessly, meaninglessly, without purpose, without any returns, then I have a problem. I accept I have to sometimes suffer. I want at least 60% of my suffering to be in some way noble. Since I like to fool around, I'm also OK with *some* of my suffering being stupid or pointless because I like to play.

> >A: I wholeheartedly agree. I've found that manifestations work best when they're as comprehensive as possible. Just imagining "the bad going away" isn't complete. It's like imagining "a dog being gone" - well, if the dog is gone, what isn't gone? Where'd the dog go? What is where the dog was? The more thorough, the better. Intend the bad going away, intend where it goes, intend how, intend what replaces it, and intend what the replacement is like.

I agree, but specifying too many details can limit the options for a semi-rigid subconscious mind like my own. Because I have limitations imposed by my "believability" criteria, I want to allow my mind some wiggle room to manifest things in a way that also accords with my rigidity. I'm not pleased with how rigid my mind is, no, but I also don't think my rigidity is going away in 1 day, which means if I want to manifest something soon, I have to give myself some slack. So nailing down every detail I think can sometimes create a barrier too. Also sometimes I might actually want a degree of surprise. Not that this is a serious concern now, lol. Right now I can barely get anything to manifest. But I can imagine even if I got to the point where anything at all would manifest exactly how I wanted it, I'd then deliberately want surprises and would probably deliberately leave unspecified windows in my spells.

Also, it's funny how you're talking about a dog going away, lol. It's almost like you know something about my life and are saying exactly what I should be hearing. Very cool.

> >A: Plus, what a drag to only thing about bad things and being rid of them.

Yes.

mindseal – On relaxation.

So my tooth was hurting again yesterday and I was using concentration and visualization to handle pain again. I noticed a few things. I noticed that I don't have to do anything directly at the site of pain to affect it (although that is one avenue of intervention). I noticed that simply relaxing at the ground of being can instantly attenuate pain at least in the short term. This is different from me relaxing as a human being, it's not an ordinary kind of relaxation, so don't get confused here. Since I realize I am not actually a human being deep down, I have the ability to do things, including to relax, as a non-human something or other, and this has different effects. Relaxing as a human just relaxes my body and nothing else happens. Relaxing as that which is beyond human not only relaxes the body, it also weakens structure and brightens up manifested appearances. Such relaxation changes how the human body feels and it also changes how the world feels. I feel like if I keep it up, the body and the world will dissolve, and from there, if I had a commitment of that sort, I could possibly dream myself into a new type of realm.

What's interesting is that pain seems to kick up a notch my ability to concentrate. I guess I still consider pain an emergency. So while I was taking a shower, I was doing the healing water visualization where I consider the shower water to be extraordinary as it runs over me. I was running it pretty hot, and then I started to focus on the idea that "all phenomena are peace." And what's interesting, when my mind fell into a concentrated state pretty easily and quickly thanks to my toothache, the water's heat sensation disappeared. At one point it disappeared so thoroughly that I started having doubts about the entire experience! I thought, maybe this water was cold in the first place? Maybe I didn't do anything at all. But when I stopped contemplating the peaceful nature of all phenomena, the heat sensation came back.

This kind of experience happened to me a number of times, usually when I play with the temperature sensations outside. When I get really successful it feels like I am actually not doing anything and it's the street temp that changes and not anything say in my human body. So for example, if I am practicing cooling off in the summer heat, at first it may feel like the street is oppressively hot and there is a region of coolness that I am working on in my human body. As I concentrate on allowing the visualized coolness to flow into the manifest experience, sometimes it feels like the whole street is cool, and what used to look like hot summer sun begins to look like a bright but cold winter sun. In this state it's very easy to think that I didn't do anything again.

This happens because I wrongly associate intent with effort and struggle, still. Of course the truest and deepest intent is effortless. So when one succeeds in the best possible way it may deceptively feel like it's always been that way, whatever you were trying to manifest. It definitely works that way for me.

This also brings up the ambiguous nature of experience. If I had a doubter in me, there'd be plenty of meat to chew. I could just easily disown all the effortless phenomena and consider that maybe the water in the shower, or the street just changed temperature for reasons beyond my intent. To really entertain such doubts seriously I would need to keep clinging to the idea that intent is always and only effort, however.

Back to pain. I notice that pain is a complex multi-factor phenomenon. It seems like lots of things affect it. Destroying the visualized image of humanity in myself alleviated pain, as well as imagining that I was the only being in existence, as well as relaxing at the mysterious base of experience beyond the human identity. It seems a huge component of pain is actually social. Pain hurts a lot more when I want to belong to a group. When I consider myself solitary, I get a lot more leeway in how to interpret the sensations and I also get more leeway

to play with the sensations. In retrospect this isn't surprising because the function of convention is to stabilize meanings. But just when I want to change an experience, that stability works against my interests. For most humans this is an acceptable trade off because they'd probably run to a doctor and use that experience of pain to feel love and attention from a doctor. For me such trade off is not a very good one, and seems less good by the day.

So if one were really really successful at a feat of magick, it may feel like nothing at all has been done thanks to effortlessness. In that state it would be trivial to forget the magical nature of phenomena and the relevance of intent. One can get caught in one's own perfectly created dream, and the dream can begin to run away into random directions if one disowns it too much. I need to be careful not to be a victim of my own success.

AesirAnatman – Remote senses and de-fixating on physicalist, body-centric perception

I've grown particularly interested in developing the psychic senses (the "remote" senses) as a middle-term/long-term spiritual goal recently. Not in the sense of communicating with spirits directly or symbolically via those clair-senses, but in the sense of generally attaining experiences and knowledge from the illusory world in ways not seemingly tied to the illusory physicalist/body-centric mentality.

Now, you might say 'why would you want to develop this if ultimately there is no world out there and it's all an illusion?' Well, even if it's an illusion, you're somewhat going to be playing as if it is not, as long as you are maintaining any sense of "senses"/"experiences" of the world that do not consciously feel like explicit actions/intentions on your part - i.e. if you want any form of othering.

So, with othering there will be a feeling of some experiences/knowledge/information coming from 'somewhere else' (even if you think of it as your own subconscious). The catch is that in a physicalist mindset, we limit the sorts of incoming information to strictly physically tied modes (senses tied to material sense organs that only give information/experience when in a certain spatial relationship to other material objects - and then all more abstract knowledge of the world must be derived from that materially rooted information). So, I think a materially tied conception of consciousness is a major aspect of rebirth (i.e. body dies -> mind dies/has major forgetfulness). Thus, I think one of the keys to moving toward liberation from rebirth/attaining immortality/self-deification is at least loosening up if not eliminating the fixation of physical senses from material body-organs (so at minimum having "remote senses" as an options if not always active) as well as loosening our ability to learn abstract knowledge about the world only by conclusions from sensory/experiential data (so, it should be possible to gain abstract information about the world without drawing conclusions from experience a la psychometry or claircognizance or whatever.

Of course, these alternative senses are all as adjustable as the ordinary senses. So you might remote-vision that there is a couch in the other room. If you are practiced well enough, you can make that couch dissolve, just like you could make the couch you seemingly see with you eyes dissolve before you. That leads me to an important point. Your ordinary senses are forms of psychic senses. You are just shaping them exclusively in ways that we would consider bodily/physical/sense-organ-oriented. A lot of this is related to some ideas in my post ‘The Construction of the Senses’.

So, in conclusion, I'm going to be exploring how to start taking the baby steps to develop these sorts of abilities in my future, just like I am doing with magick/manifestation/attraction/whatever you want to call it.

I feel like there's probably some parallels between the two. With magick, a big part of it is first learning any degree of conscious focus/concentration/will even in ordinary life. Then you can apply it to things you believe are possible/probable and the idea is to progressive increase the difficulty/unlikelihood of the transformations you attempt. So, with remote senses, how to start and develop the requisite skills and powers? It's something I'm going to be thinking about and commenting about as time goes on. I think that healing is one good beginners skill with magick. And I think that psychic-body awareness is a good correspondent psychic sense skill to develop for beginners. I realize now that in many ways I’ve already developed this skill as I’ve practiced healing, I just didn’t know it or have a conception consciously of what I was doing or what it meant in the

bigger picture. But there are many many fun and interesting ways to practice. (I wonder what is the closest psychic-sense correspondent, if there is one, to the form of abstract magick that is probability/spell-casting style magick? Hmm)

[...]

[[mindseal: Imagination is as much an experience as seeing a keyboard in front of one as one types. The only difference is vividness, stability, and meaning. All 3 of these are of course mental and subjective differences that land on some continuum of possibilities. Anything unstable can be stabilized. Anything stable can be destabilized. Anything faint can be made more vivid. Anything vivid can be made faint. And meanings can all be re-assigned in limitless ways. I do agree that involvement with a modality of senses we have convinced ourselves is "physical" is responsible for an experience of birth, death and rebirth. To the extent we have convinced ourselves that our bodies are necessary basis for consciousness, once the body is seen as incoherent in some way, our faith in consciousness must collapse, and this can explain amnesia and a kind of break in experience. One very obvious example here is when my dream body is damaged grievously and then I usually wake up. Of course there is no raw need to wake up, but my mind usually cannot continue dreaming once the dream body has been damaged beyond a certain point inside some dream environment. However there have been some notable exceptions to this especially post-training.

But, amnesia and breaks in experience also occur during the cycles of dreaming and waking, and yet there is no corresponding perceived danger to the body. Instead there is a sense of tiredness, which is a mental strain, which appears to beg itself to be resolved through an incredibly deep rest whereby one gives up on trying to keep track of the so-called "external reality." So in other words, tracking objects during waking is tiresome work. When I say "tracking objects" I don't only mean following some objects as if they preexist awareness. I mean maintaining conviction in such objects, creating, maintaining, destroying them, etc. All this while still knowing that there is neither creation nor destruction in an ultimate sense. I mean the whole process from top to bottom without any preexisting anything short of pure potential and mental 3-sided capacity. But there is just no good two word phrase to describe that. "Tracking" is too passive and is not a good way to describe what's happening, which is much more creative, but I'm using it for now anyway.

So there is something incredibly bad about waking. It is so bad in fact that as far as we know, anyone who was forced to continually stay awake has "died." As far as I know, supposedly there is only one case of a single man somewhere in China who doesn't need any sleep at all.

That means there is something toxic about waking, and something healing about dreaming. And yet there is something about waking that we crave, so we keep trying to return to it. Perhaps the seeming solidity is addictive. Maybe we crave more epic stories than those that are possible in ordinarily very fleeting dreams. A most typical dream episode is between 15 minutes to 1 hour in my experience. There is not much story development that can happen in 1 hour. It appears we want stories that develop over decades, and maybe even longer. So we maintain consistency throughout experience. Waking can be seen as episodic in the same way dreaming is episodic. We can be seen as deliberately stitching waking episodes into a grand narrative while we allow dreams to be more disjointed.

One thing I've noticed is that when I have an occasional episode of "losing consciousness" I no longer lose myself or associate with what's going on. Ordinarily I would think something like "I am blanking out." These days I see it's not me who is blanking out. I am fine. I see myself as being healthy and indeed invincible. I stand

outside experience altogether. I observe the experience of blanking while feeling invincible and separate. I know this blanking is not me and does not at all affect me. This isn't just how I think, but it's a way of feeling too, and it deeply changes the whole experience of blanking. It's like sitting in a movie theater and the screen is going dark, but you know you're just fine because the screen is not you. You're safe in a chair quite a distance away from the screen. This kind of attitude I imagine would very much help during a rebirth experience. It's to avoid taking whatever is going on as happening *to* me. Instead I am having experiences but these experiences are not things done to me. Experience is not a wound, basically. Experience is not a deformation of my being. I have a being that remains whole no matter the experience. My 3-sided capacity remains flawless and all-capable at all times. That's like saying that even in the middle of an experience of bright light, my ability to experience darkness is not damaged. And in the middle of experiencing darkness my ability to experience bright light is not damaged. That's capacity. Capacity is constant. To identify myself with the 3-sided capacity is to put myself completely beyond the range of the play of experience, while still allowing myself access to mold that experience through will. So a movie director is completely beyond the range of the movie, but still is able to direct the movie. A book author is beyond the range of the in-book setting, but is able to mold that setting.

It's this kind of contemplation that I find most helpful. From here how to structure one's senses is very much up to me. I could develop ways to allow visions to inform me of my long standing commitment. Basically what I call "the world" is just a long-standing commitment of mine. I treat some mostly-visceral experiences as "informative" and "revelatory" with regard to that commitment. So if I look outside the window I can learn what the weather is like outside. That experience is considered "revelatory." It reveals the state of the weather. It's also imprinting: once I see it, I am convinced I just "got exposed to a situation" that is ongoing and relatively stable. That's imprinting. It *sticks* once seen. Of course it's entirely possible to take what is considered "loose imagination" now and stitch it (via training) in a way that's more structured to my core commitment of what I call "the world." This would create the so-called "extra sensory perception" although such naming is a bad one. It's not extra-sensory at all, obviously. Imagination itself is not really extra sensory in an ultimate sense.

So I think what you want to do is possible, and any hands-on experience with deliberately changing the structure of your basic experience is going to help you gain confidence in yourself as a singular 3-sided capacity to know, to will, and to experience. Which in turn can contribute to a reduction in fearing certain types of experiences. But it would only be a contribution I think. Fear is really complex with so many variables. If you weaken a certain contributing factor in some grand fear, that doesn't automatically mean you've made progress on all the other relevant factors. But it's all good. One has to take whatever bites out of a big cake one can, in order to eat.

There are basically two flaws when relating to experience:

1. Exaggerated sense of foreignness.
2. Exaggerated sense of identity.

#1 means one believes experience hails from some extra-mental objective realm "out there."

#2 means I believe some specific experience is "me" when in fact I am only a 3-sided capacity instead of any specific experience.

There is also something we might call "overcorrecting." Overcorrecting for #1 we get identifying oneself with all experience, which is even worse than #2. But overcorrecting for #2 we get an extreme loss of personal agency and a sense that oneself doesn't exist at all, or only exists as a passive and helpless observer, but only the separate domain exists "out there".]]

AesirAnatman – A Fool's Quest: Chasing Happiness and Running from Suffering

Many people devote themselves to attaining perfect happiness, as a goal. They're tired of being unsatisfied, and they want to be satisfied. They want to be happy and not suffer, not experience things they don't like anymore. The source of happiness and unhappiness is clear enough: you are a being with desires. You prefer certain experiences, beliefs, and ideas to others. You are happy when you manifest the things you desire. You enjoy those experiences and want to hold on to them. And, you are unhappy when you manifest the things you don't desire. You suffer those experiences and want to be rid of them.

Your desires can extend over all possible types of cognition, including desires themselves. So, you might desire to structure your personality and character a particular way, and so you might have preferences about what desires you want to manifest in your mind.

At root, though, all these desires sprout from having a vision of a future you prefer, which is contrasted from your vision of a future you do not prefer.

A problem that often develops is that people become confused. They begin to think that what they don't like is being dissatisfied, in abstract. They think they want to avoid suffering. They begin to think that what they do like is being satisfied, in abstract. They think they want to chase happiness. They start to run away from the fact that they're running away from things. They start chasing after the state of not chasing after things.

They start to think that if they just override their normal desiring tendencies, they can manifest eternal happiness in their mind. What this desire to be happy and avoid suffering amounts to is a desire to avoid desiring. It's a feedback loop of suffering.

What ends up happening is that the people pursuing this path gradually learn to adjust their desires. They become less and less concerned with the state of the world around them, eventually becoming unconcerned with even their own body. They exclusively develop tolerance to and disinterest in outer phenomena, because they learn to take more direct control of their own bliss. Taken further, they lose concern for wisdom v. ignorance. They lose concern for understanding their own condition. Eventually, if we imagine this process playing out over many lifetimes, such a being will enter a state of disembodied, timeless, stateless, inner bliss-button pushing. They'll have no concerns or interests other than experiencing and maintaining their psychic bliss-drug.

But, they've finally hit the wall here. Do you see it? They're still concerned with maintaining a state of psychic bliss and avoiding desires. But that itself is a desire! They're still maintaining a sense of desire and unhappiness because they have to constantly be on the watch over their own mind and intentions to make sure they don't go back to having desires anymore. Alas, they've finally come to see that their desire to be without desire is unquenchable.

At this point they have a few options:

- Either they accept a slight degree of unhappiness and desire, and realize that what they wanted was simplicity, nothingness, and dullness (and imo boringness, but maybe this is what some people are after). In that case, they will continue to live with the almost-bliss-drug in infinite nothingness.

- Or they try to attain true desirelessness by giving up their desire to be desireless and eternally blissed out. In doing so, they open themselves up to flippantly re-manifesting all sorts of possible desires, because they no longer prefer bliss to desire. Without a preference, the ever-present decision to manifest bliss v. desire will eventually recreate new desires. Thus, they unintentionally and ignorantly return to the sort of life they were running away from.
- Or, they realize that they're quest has been futile, and they understand the inherent desirousness, and unsatisfactory nature of cognition as a sentient being. They embrace having desires and preference and stop rejecting themselves and fighting themselves.

Pleasure (as in satisfaction/gratification) is not something to seek after. Pain (as in dissatisfaction/non-gratification) is not something to run away from. Seek that which you desire, and run from that to which you are averse. Don't knot your inner world up and get caught desiring not to desire. And then desiring not to desire not to desire. And desiring not to desire not to desire not to desire...etc. It's a huge source of confusion and anxiety if you try to fight desire itself, if you try to get happiness or avoid suffering in themselves.

Instead, embrace yourself. Don't fight yourself. Make your goal self-understanding. What are your desires, regarding all aspects of cognition? Is there anything about your apparent world, or about your psychic structure you desire to change? How can you most effectively manifest whatever it is that you desire? What is the path to attaining your desires? This is how you develop wisdom and, the natural byproduct of wisdom, power. Learn about your desires, and then respect your desires and practice taking responsibility for yourself by working to achieve your desires.

You'll never attain perfect, pure happiness. There is no state of unending bliss with no desires or preoccupations. And even when you achieve whatever you desire right now, your desires are not fixed. It's very likely that you will change your desires over the aeons, and then the new task of satisfying those desires will begin.

You cannot escape the desire-based cycle of happiness and suffering. Embrace desire. There is no escape. By embracing unhappiness and understanding it, you free yourself from the anxiety about being unhappy. You free yourself to infinitely explore your desires, to understand your desires, to accept yourself for who you are at the deepest level, rather than running from your desires, being ignorant of your desires, and rejecting who you are at the deepest level.

Sit in your unhappiness when it rises. Explore it. Don't always run from it. Pain is a beautiful teacher. Love yourself. Take care of yourself by understanding and taking responsibility for your desires. Don't be afraid to be in pain, and to admit you're in pain. When you acknowledge your own pain, you can acknowledge everyone's pain. You can acknowledge the fact that you don't like the way certain things are, and can acknowledge that others don't like the way certain things are.

Love your pain. Get to know it. Become friends with pain. Say "how are you, pain? Have I been neglecting you?" Love your suffering. Love your unhappiness. Love your sadness. Love your anger. Love your hatred. You'll only make things worse if you hate your pain.

You'll be comfortable with the fact that you're unhappy with certain things and want to change them (or want to keep happy things the same), and you'll be comfortable with the fact that others are unhappy with certain things and want to change them (or want to keep happy things the same). You won't have to demand

that you are always happy, or that others are always happy. Of course, your desires and their desires are different. But, you all have desires nonetheless.

Understand your desires. Love your nature as a being who desires. Don't run from yourself. Love yourself. Take care of yourself. Focus on what you want. That's what you always do. Just *realize it*. Know thyself.

mindseal – Imagination continuum.

At some point I've come to realize that I've been underestimating the role of mental life conventional people call "imagination." From the POV of convention imagination serves as inspiration for art and science, but more often than not imagination is something that is said to take people *away* from the so-called "reality." Thus the term "imagination" has a lot of pejorative uses from the POV of convention.

From the POV of subjective idealism, imagination is any kind of experience. Why so? Because when no experience can be said to be informative or conclusive, it has to be understood as imaginary. Experiences are merely suggestive because there is always a choice in how to interpret and how to relate to them. This is what allows a peer to perform subjectively strange transformations of experiences. Experience is malleable and so it can be bent, shaped, molded, restructured, orchestrated, charmed, enchanted, cajoled, invited, attracted or repelled, guided, to name only a few possibilities. And experience is malleable precisely because it is merely suggestive and isn't informative.

If a person believes in an objective domain of some sort, then they typically will view some of their experiences as hailing from that domain, and therefore will view such experiences as being informative. For a subjective idealist an objective domain is only at best a play-pretend commitment to an imaginary mental fabrication.

For the purpose of this article I want the reader to be aware that imagination can be extremely varied. It can be any sort of concrete imagery, such as what happens when visualizing a tree along with some scenery. And it can also be supremely abstract, such as what is experienced during abstract thinking. One can *imagine* different *ways of structuring* experience, and that's something very abstract.

I find it useful to distinguish subjectively different grades or types of imagination. Ultimately all imaginary activity can be understood to belong to a smooth continuum of imagination, but for the sake of communication I will identify a few types. However any time I talk about the types of imagination the reader should realize that I don't want to imply rigid and always unambiguous distinctions between these types.

I think it's best to start with the most obvious and proceed toward the most subtle.

The most obvious type of imagination is the content of the 5 conventional senses: sight, sound, human body sense (touch, heat/cold, up/down, hunger, thirst, internal pressure, etc.), taste, smell. This content often hovers like a very dynamic cloud right at the center of one's experience, and it tends to be very structured, patterned and cyclical for a typical reader whom I imagine is reading this. And the reader maybe imagines someone must have written this post. This sort of imagination could be called central or centered potential. It's that which has been most emphasized in the mind.

Next is the imaginary near potential. So for example, if you see an electronic screen in front of you right now, it's very easy to imagine the same screen being slightly to the left of where it is now. Notice, I am not necessarily talking about visualizing yet. Visualization is a kind of imagination too, but imagination is not limited to only visualization. For the purpose of this article being able *to conceive* of a possibility is also a kind of imagination. So it's easy to imagine the screen being in a slightly different position. It's also easy to imagine some of the words in this post being slightly different while retaining the same meaning and so on. Most conventional possibilities may belong here. Very well practiced magickal transformations belong here. So for

example, if you're a practiced lucid dreamer, then the possibility of a lucid dream will be in the near potential. Thus you can imagine yourself having a lucid dream and this falls firmly with the range of expected and reliable possibilities.

Next is the imaginary medium potential. This is something that you believe is hard, but possible. So maybe you can imagine your body lifting a very heavy weight that is somewhat heavier than the heaviest you remember yourself lifting before. In terms of convention, you might imagine a type of device that could conceivably be engineered within say 20 years of research and development. As far as magickal transformations go, think of some that you think you could achieve in this lifetime, but haven't yet. Or think of those transformations that don't work very reliably.

Next is the imaginary far potential. Far potential is everything that's pretty much subjectively ludicrous, but still imaginable. So for example, let's say I imagine my body going through a wall during the so-called "waking" state. (My body goes through my wall.) I can imagine that. I can imagine myself creating a universe or twisting space and time. Presently it doesn't feel like such things are in the cards, so to speak, but because I can conceive of them they are contained in my imaginary far potential.

Next is the infinite region of imagination that is *imaginable only in principle*, but is presently unimaginable. This is a very important type of imagination. If anyone is interested in mastery of imagination, then it's crucial to recognize that imagination is *not limited* to only that which you can *presently* imagine.

Consider a metaphor of a glowing and noisy cloud for imagination. Imagination is like a cloud floating through infinity. It is purely mental and it is very amazing and seductive. Imagination is both a blessing and a curse. Imagination used wisely and skillfully is a blessing. And imagination used foolishly or clumsily is a curse. The center of the cloud of imagination is the brightest and most solid-looking (but don't let it fool ya!). Because it is right at the center of our attention most of the time, it has the tendency to bedazzle the unwary. Said bedazzling has happened to me more times that I can reasonably mention or count. Moving away from the center there is all kinds of sensory and conceptual content in the cloud and as we move closer to the edge the content becomes subjectively more and more strange, outrageous or improbable. One can direct one's attention to the different areas of the imagination cloud, more or less at will.

And here I want to add a few more observations. The cloud changes just as the state of your volition changes. A very interesting, peculiar and somewhat rare event is when you notice how for the first time that you can remember you're able to imagine something that formerly you were unable to imagine. It means something that was formerly only imaginable in principle became newly imaginable in subjective actuality. When you experience this, you can be certain that your volition has made a significant shift, probably a shift in one of the core commitments. It's also possible for things to slip outside the cloud of imagination and once again remain only a part of the infinite imagination that's imaginable only in principle. Generally this sort of slippage isn't noticeable, duh.

It's also possible for things to move from far potential to medium and then to near and in reverse from near to medium and then to far. So for example, if you've recently overcame insomnia by learning how to fall asleep better, the possibility of insomnia moves from near to medium potential.

It's important to note that the various contents are able to move around inside the imagination cloud and they move from and to the cloud for one reason: the changed state of one's own volition. But because one's own volition typically contains a disowned or 'othered' aspect, it means the movements can fall anywhere

along the continuum of consciousness-unconsciousness. When I say "movements" I mean changes in the felt-sense of probability, relevance, and actuality of said contents with regard to the contents in the center of the cloud. So there can be plenty of continual unconscious drift inside the imagination cloud.

Contemplation can easily work with the entire cloud of imagination, just like you're probably doing now. Most utility magick works in the near potential. Massively transformative and breakthrough magick can work with the further potentials.

It's good to pay attention to your attention inside the cloud. So how often do you wander the entire cloud of imagination? How often do you examine the center of the cloud? How often do you examine the near potential areas of the cloud? How often do you examine the further, medium potential areas of the cloud? How often do you prowl the edge of the cloud with your attention? You might notice how you can see some thickness of the cloud instead of just a small area. For example, you may see the electronic screen with this article in front of your eyes, which is in the center of the cloud, while simultaneously being aware of ideas, sights, sounds and other mental impressions in the further regions of the cloud.

Another metaphor I'll throw out there is life as an animated multilayered imagination cake. It can be very helpful to imagine one's own imagination in many ways.

A conventional person will hold the center of the cloud, the brightest experiential aspects, the structured, patterned and cyclical contents of the 5 senses as true existents, and as informative. Whereas the rest of the experiential contents will appear "purely" suggestive to a conventional person and thus a conventional person may speak of something being "*only* imaginary." They're *so convinced* the center of the cloud is not imaginary. And they take this conviction with them to their nighttime dreams too, thus believing the scenarios in those dreams to be real happenings until *after* they wake up and have a chance to *reevaluate those happenings in retrospect*.

Because a peer doesn't regard any area of the imagination cloud as fundamentally different from any other area, it is possible to move imaginary artifacts from the near region to the center region at will, and in reverse. Here I'll remind the reader just how broadly I've defined imagination at the beginning of the article. What allows for this fluid movement is precisely *the absence of a firmly insisted-upon impermeable conceptual boundary* between the types of imagination, and particularly a boundary between the center and every other area of the imagination cloud. A peer may choose to still maintain a boundary between the center of the cloud and the rest of the cloud, but that boundary will be permeable at will with possibly some self-imposed conditions to prevent random unwanted alterations.

Thus if your body is cold, you can imagine a hot region overlaid right over the cold region of experience and begin moving heat from the hot region to the cold one, as if they're "physically" side by side. That's just one example of how to use imagination, and not the complete manual.

And a final note. When images or concepts are given more and more weight in the mind, it moves them closer and closer to the near potential. So I believe daydreaming is *crucial.* It's only *during daydreaming* that you can *consciously* move something from a middle of the cloud to the nearby region of the cloud. So making something improbable probable requires a significant amount of intentional daydreaming. Can you imagine how important imagination is? ;)

[...]

> [A: I'd also like to add to the metaphor of imagination existing in layers of 'nearest' and 'farthest' that such a metaphor isn't only relevant for potential present or future experiences, but also past and latent experiences. For example, the answers to 'how' and 'why' you find yourself in the current circumstances in which you find yourself might be discovered through thoroughly examining the history of your own imagination. Which things became increasingly farther from the realm of possibility for you over time? Nearer? Is the 'potential distance' of something you can imagine only far away because of some past experience that pushed it there? Can you re-evaluate that and bring it 'nearer' to the realm of immediate possibility?]

I like this a lot. I certainly have a subjective-imaginative *probabilistic history* of this sort that includes but also transcends the conventional contents of this big dream.

> [A: IMO a general rule is that the closer something is to 'near potential', the better. There may be a few exceptions, but for most purposes, I think it's a noble endeavor to try to bring as many things in from the outer rim of abstract conceivability into the inner circle of visceral potentiality.]

There is a giant amount of content on the outer rim, and I agree that it is noble to bring *some* of it, tastefully, into the near and centered potential region of the imagination cloud. That's how I understand what you're saying.

I also find it interesting how rarely I visit the outer rim. Because most things there by definition are thought to be outlandish and we're strongly discouraged by convention to think about anything that's outlandish, since it's often considered just a waste of time. If I take responsibility for convention, then it's not quite right to say that convention encourages or discourages something in me because it is I who am conventioning when I am being conventional.

> [A: Just sitting and thinking, imagining, wondering, visualizing, etc. is an amazing act. It has a very impressive effort:reward ratio. When carried out with right understanding and right intention, it's fun and easy and immensely rewarding.]

Daydreaming sounds so simple, but I agree that it hides huge potential in it, especially if it's a deliberate and/or mindful kind of daydreaming.

mindseal – Maintaining an attitude and a frame of mind of a Deity.

Why do lucid dreams at the height of their development seem so amazing? One big reason for this is that lucid dreams give many experienced lucid dreamers a preview of what it's like to be God. As you learn to bend reality in your dream, and as you get better and better at not only playing a role in your dream, but also at being an indisputable and tyrannical conductor of the entire dream, you approach Godliness.

The power of lucidity is not a democracy. It is absolute tyranny. This is why when I want to have sex in my dreams, when I am lucid, there is no discussion or debate about it. The first girl I see is hot, and that's no accident, and I take her hand, and she wants to fuck me as much as I want to fuck her. Why does this happen? Why is it so flawless? That's because I understand the meaning of true tyranny and in my dreams I allow myself to feel this in a way I don't yet allow myself to feel during waking.

True tyranny is divine. When it is exercised, the subjects don't feel oppressed. They feel like they want to do whatever it is you want to do. It feels voluntary through and through. There is no resistance. It is instant and flawless. There is no adjustment or fine-tuning. Things turn out to be magically always right the first time, seemingly beyond any reason.

The way to learn to feel this way in your dreams is to disregard all facts. Whatever dream situation appears to your mind, a typical, conventional attitude would be to take the apparent situation as fact, as evidence of something. This is why most dreamers who are accustomed to relating to their senses as avenues of evidence, they also fall prey to their dream environments and become victims of the circumstances in their own dreams. Then the dream monster as presented by the 5 senses is evidence of a real monster that really wants to get you. And then if people resist your advances or ideas, that's taken as evidence that your point of view is not absolute, and that you must contend with something besides yourself "out there." To overcome this victim trap, upon lucidity you have to instantly disregard everything you witness. You have to realize that nothing in the sphere of the 5 senses is a fact. You're witnessing only a one possibility out of an infinity of possibilities. To a lucid dreamer all configurations of sense bases are no longer factual or evidential. They're just accidental and they're subject to volition and to imagination. *What is* becomes subjugated by *what could be*.

This frame of mind is radically anti-conservative. A conservative frame of mind is to always *preserve* appearances and to always resist "what could be." That's why conservatives always look to history for inspiration. To a conservative mindset "what is" is also "how it always was" and also "how it always will be."

To take the lucid advantage to a waking consciousness you have to do something very much similar during waking. Stop relying on facts. Stop relying on evidence. Claim your divinity. Don't ask for permission. Just do it. Don't be reasonable about it. There is no one and nothing you would need to reason with. Reasoning is still a subtle act of asking for a permission. When we reason, we want the faculty of reason to agree before we engage in something. From the POV of a deity, the faculty of reason will become your slave. Your reason will be there to explain in ways that others will find impossible to argue with, why what you want to do is reasonable, when in truth you just do what you want to do, and that's that. Reason then becomes like a corrupt lawyer who is tirelessly working to keep your wishes safe and you entertained, and if you are resolute, then even an army of 100 million philosophers working together will not prove anything wrong.

When you try maintain an attitude and a frame of mind of a deity during waking, it may so happen that it will be overwhelming. That's because we have so much stuff in our past, and the past is not just "past." The past is present in our mind right now, and it is held there deliberately by intent, because it was valuable at least at one time, and if nothing else, it gives us a sense of continuity of identity, continuity to which we tend to cling. Who wants to become a being with no history? Not even personal history?

So when you move powerfully against convention, what happens is you might feel pain in your body. That's because your body is a shadow of your past. The correct attitude at this point is to regard such pain as helpful. This pain is not a "message from the universe to stop." It's the same thing as when you feel pain from lifting weights. When you lift weights, and you're not accustomed to it, your body will ache. That isn't a message that you're doing something wrong. It's only a signal that what you're doing is not something you are accustomed to. Further, regard any possibility of injury on this path as wonderful. Convention can't grab hold of your mind or intent. They can strike out at your body and nothing else. Then tell your body, "If you, my arm, allow yourself to be taken by the others, you were never my ally to begin with. You are a traitor. You may go. You are a weakness. Losing you is nothing more than losing weakness. Losing you is nothing more than losing a disease. If others should take you, go, go, go." Accept only those parts of your being which are committed to your cause. And be ready and willing to let go of any parts that are not. Jesus was talking about this when he said something like "if your eye sins, rip it out." Basically, your ordinary bodies are traitorous to your deepest wishes if your wishes involve transcendence and divinity of any kind. Do not be fooled. Do not grieve. There is nothing in the entire universe that keeps it going outside of your own constant and unremitting commitment. Once your commitment to the universe authentically and genuinely comes to an end, the universe will dissolve like an illusion that it always and ever was.

When a relatively normal person returns to a world of solidity after experiencing something amazing, what happens? Why the return? Is there something that forces such a return? Think about it. If you resolve to never return, what could possibly force you? It would have to be your own idea and your own commitment to the externality of the universe. It would have to be your own love and desire for the universe. It would have to be you. People don't realize this, but they energize and power every little piece of garbage in their lives by their own love and life juice. Reawakening the memory that you really are God is all about restoring that love and life juice back to yourself. It's a universal reset. It's you, as God, saying, "Enough is enough, I will not play this game anymore. If the Universe wants to do it, it will need to find its own strength and energy to do it. I am out." And what do you know? Once you're out, you'll discover universe was empty and hollow and it has nothing in it that was powering it from the outside of your being.

When you maintain a deific attitude for even one month, you'll realize how much bullshit you used to believe that isn't really true. Conventional thinking will begin to stick out so vividly and obviously. Things you would take for granted will gradually begin to sound absurd. It's a period of great discovery.

There is much more that can be said about this. I could write a book about being a diety. But this is just a reddit post.

[...]

/r/weirdway is as close to a book as I want to get. This, together with the writing from my friends, is something that leaves me content for now.

mindseal – Ordinary meditation to magick is what scales are to music.

Meditation has become pretty popular lately and I believe rightly so.

However, I also believe it's important to recognize that most meditation rides on the back of a very simple and unsophisticated intent. For example, the calmness meditation strives for nothing other than a vision of pacification and the smoothing out of of experience. Most so-called "insight" meditation that's being discussed on the Buddhist forums is not any kind of actual insight, but instead rides on a relatively passive observation of changes in experience with the intent being simply to observe and recognize what's happening. Plus there is a conclusion that you're expected to reach before you even start: that all phenomena are impermanent. Obediently falling in line with some expected conclusion is not how one develops insight.

If you believe you "observe" your experience, you generally cannot also believe you are shaping your experience. Observation generally implies a passive, non-meddling kind of presence. Of course there can be exceptions to this, but I am talking about a general case as I see it.

So most meditation I tend to run across, including all the jhanas described in the Pali Buddhist literature, are nothing more than simple scales. They are rudimentary. Which isn't to say they're always easy.

Nobody I am aware of becomes a musician with the idea of becoming awesome at playing scales. Scales are used as an exercise to make your fingers more limber and stronger and to enhance the mind-finger pathway. However, if playing scales is all you do, you're not a musician. Generally nobody goes to a concert to hear an expert rendition of the scales (some moron will prove me wrong, no doubt, just wait for it). Playing scales is not what anyone wants to actually be doing. It's a means to an end.

Similarly meditation of a widely taught variety is exactly like playing scales. At best it's a means to an end. At its worst it's a trap that makes you believe you're playing music whereas you're just playing 4 dumb notes in succession, over and over, like a robot.

So I never use simple meditation with the idea that such meditation is enlightenment or the final goal in life or anything like that. I only view it as a rudimentary exercise that isn't equally necessary for all people. Some people are naturally good at controlling their minds. Such people would waste their precious time were they to do simple meditation and I believe should consider instead doing something more creative, more imaginative, and more expressive with their minds. I'm not going to judge who is or isn't such a person. You have to decide this for yourselves. I will also say that you can begin playing some pretty decent and pretty enjoyable music long, long before you attain a complete mastery of the scales. So even if you intend to get better at the scales, you can also play some good music too.

I meditate sometimes, but I mostly concern myself with magick. I don't want to be like a misguided "musician" who only keeps getting better and better and better at playing scales. I wasn't born to do the mental equivalent of the scales in music. At the same time I can see how practicing scales can be of use. How about you?

[...]

> [Q: I enjoyed this post a lot when I read it on the other sub (and still do, lol). I feel you have added to it and it's even better. So, I'm curious what magickal practices are common place for you especially, but also anyone else who sees this comment.]

Healing (not necessarily always related to disease, it can just be boosting the sense of body to beyond normal), playing with temperature sensations, charging food. In the past I also used to do a lot of lucid dreaming, which I do much less now. A big thing I am doing now is imagining how my post-human life will be. I'm tired of being a human and I'm spending a lot of time considering what sort of being I want to be next. What sort of world do I want to live in next. That sort of thing. And I still practice all sorts of things in contemplation, like for example, getting rid of a sense that I have to be somewhere. Instead I replace that sense with a feeling that I am already and always where I want to be: in my mind. I train to relax my grip on a perceived external context and to learn to be at home within. Or put another way, I train to take my mind (the way I define 'mind') as my body and my human body as a vision. I train to focus my mind, but I will later on also work on seeding the subconscious mind. I kinda work on both in parallel, but I still use conscious focusing more than the subconscious seeding. I figure once I am happy with my ability to focus, I'll start training to run subconscious programming, you know, the magick that's autopiloted/othered and doesn't need to be focused on consciously to work. I also try to improve my imagination. I've gotten a tiny bit better at imagining and visualizing things. I explore some pretty absurd concepts and visions more than before. And I watch out for particularly interesting moments, which I then write up as articles here.

mindseal – One backward idea I had about magick, revealed recently.

I was walking around in a park and decided to apply a transformation to my experience when I kept hearing an annoying siren that just wouldn't shut up.

As soon as I decided that, the siren started to get quieter, with some subtle ups and downs in volume, but trending downward in volume. But this wasn't happening fast enough for my liking. So I was then focusing this way and that, and I was adjusting my mentality like this and like that to make it go faster. And then it struck me.

It struck me that the reason I was doing that is because on some level I was still assuming that magick is something objective, and then it was my job to find the one right way to do it. I had to match my activity to something I imagined to be objectively the most effective way of performing a transformation.

Then I realized the idiocy of that belief and I found it funny how I still continued to believe it on some level even though I know better. I'm not even sure I've learned my lesson. It's entirely possible the next time some transformation doesn't work fast enough, I'll be trying to "tune" it, lol. I hope not. At minimum I shouldn't tune anything with the idea that I'm matching what I am doing to some external unbending and eternal standard.

[...]

> > So here you might still be assuming there's something you have to change.

Yes, there is. I should start assuming I am always successful and that it's a matter of time and the overall shape of my mentality, and not a matter of in-the-moment technique. It's not a change in technique, but it is a change.

> > I think a subtractive approach towards volition is not as effective and efficient as simply defining the parameters of your reality and focusing on those parameters.

So abandon a subtractive approach and undertake a "defining parameters" approach. That's a change. :) You're also talking about change.

Change isn't inherently bad, imo.

> [Q: For example, as I was typing this reply there was a crow outside that's been cawing for a while but I hadn't noticed it and it didn't bother me until I started looking for a noise to practice on. So I focused and intended for it to stop but all that did was bring the crow visually to my attention as I noticed it sitting and cawing on the neighbor's roof. Eventually I gave up and went back to doing my work and that's when it flew away.]

This is very different from what I was describing in my post. In my post I sensed a direct connection between me wanting my experience to be a certain way and it becoming a certain way, but it just wasn't fast enough. That's not the same thing as feeling like my volition had no traction at all.

> So in this example, focusing on making the crow disappear creates a conflict whereby I'm keeping the crow in my attention to remove it from my attention. It's counter-intuitive.

My approach is not for everyone. You really cannot be a normal human and hope to do the things I am talking about. Of course it cannot work for normal people. Sanity is a very rigid box.

You have to understand a normal person cannot simply "just try" the things I am talking about expect them to work instantly and perfectly. What's behind some of my magickal successes is lifetimes (more than one) of refining my own mentality, huge sacrifices, a lot of resolve, etc. If your background is not like my own, you will not just up and do exactly the same things as me. What your mind allows you to do depends on your mentality, and mentality is generally not something you can change *profoundly* in the space of 5 minutes. It's individual, but generally thinking in terms of lifetimes or decades is more helpful than thinking in terms of hours or minutes.

> Volition should be without terms or conditions, it just is.

I disagree. Volition is not "just is." Volition is a choice. You can either fall into a subconscious pattern and keep repeating what you already know so very very well. Or you can do things in a new way. It's a choice. Remaining with the status quo is a choice. Abandoning the status quo is a choice.

> So in saying that, does it make sense to 'test' your volition and 'build' its strength?

I never talk about testing or strength. Specifically "strength" is not a relevant parameter in my conception of volition. Volition doesn't work against some external-to-itself resistance. Instead volition is the overall shape and direction of mentality-experience.

> Yes you could say it's a change but all you're doing is making an intent, that's a first step you've always been taking and you don't do anything after that.

That's what my original submission was saying in the first place.

> How useful is it to notice how your experience is now if your intent is for it to be something else? Is there value in comparing experiences between a 'now' and a 'then' or would that be conflicting the intent?

It's useful to compare and there is no conflict. While the present appearance is only suggestive instead of informative, it's not wise to pretend that it doesn't in fact *suggest* something. Appearances have perceived meaning. I may want that meaning to change. Or I may want to elicit a specific appearance. If the only way I can do that is to adopt some unrealistic stance that requires me to evacuate the present moment, that's not going to be skillful. So it's OK to notice how experience appears now, without clinging, and then move to an experience that's different, deliberately, or in any other way.

> Yes it's subjective for sure, but we're having these discussions for the sake of elephants in the blue Ø

So is that how you see it? I am discussing this for my own sake. Maybe not entirely, but mostly. A friend of mine indirectly suggested that maybe I should post more. I'm starting to post some things now that in the past I wouldn't have posted and would instead have kept to myself. When I first started /r/weirdway, I had a lot that I *really* wanted to say. So I made a series of articles which essentially say 95% of what I wanted to say.

Then I was left without any desire to say more until a lot more insight/experience has "accumulated" (bad word, not to be taken literally). And keep in mind, I measure progress in decades and lifetimes. So if I catch everyone up to where I am now with say 40 articles, then maybe before I can make a post that's substantially new and substantially different from the same old I have to continue conscious living for another decade or so. But people want content *now*. :) Truth is, I am not a content machine. I sometimes want to say things and sometimes I don't. I'm almost always ready for a discussion and ready to answer questions, but my desire to make articles really varies from year to year or decade to decade.

> I mean you make an intent and that intent is all it takes to trigger the manifestation instead of having conditional elements or steps that need to be undertaken to allow the manifestation to occur. I think you mean the same thing when you say "Volition doesn't work against some external-to-itself resistance."?

Right. If you say "volition just is" some people think it means just sit down and start waiting, don't play with your mind at all, just wait, and eventually what you want will arrive, like on a long conveyor belt that's rolling your way with the different things on it, and the thing you want is waaaay out there, and it 'just rolls' so don't do anything, just wait. That's the image I get when I hear talk of "just is." To me "just is" is evocative of the status quo.

As for manifestation, I think the formula is more complex but not by much.

Intent - contradictory intent - habit = manifestation.

Contradictory intent is usually subconscious.

Making intent is going to be useless if there is a huge belief network in the subconscious which explains to you why your intent can never work. For example, if you believe birds exist separately from you and sing of their own independent volition, then when you will them to shut up, that's not going to fly (pardon the pun). In order for intent to work the mind has to be coherent around that intent. Coherence does not have to be perfect, but it has to be significant. So coherence is not an all or nothing proposition. One can still succeed with an intent and also some doubts going against that same intent, but the doubts will not help the process and may delay it or weaken it, also depending on how one *frames* those doubts too. So it's complex. To really do well in this process one has to know oneself and one's own desire to a very profound degree.

I want to drill a bit further into myself for anyone reading these things.

I notice that my prior physicalism didn't just up and vanish one day. Instead as I am working with subjective idealism, my physicalistic mental habits are weakening. But this is a gradual process with some ups and downs.

So typically there is quite a bit of mental inertia in my mind that will prevent most magickal intents from working. I find that it helps significantly if I am *genuinely interested* in the transformation I want to see. So for example, that time I mentioned in my original post, I *really* wanted that siren to shut up. Genuinely. So it was much easier to do that transformation then.

Later I tried doing the same thing you were telling me about: which is a kind of a "let's just see if I can do it" test. Problem is, I didn't feel genuine about it. I experienced noises I didn't care about and I felt like my only reason to manipulate those noises would be to try to "prove" something? But I also have zero desire to prove anything to myself. Then what? Turns out I cannot always contrive intent. Intent is a choice, but that choice,

for me specifically and specifically at this time, has to ride on the back of some genuine need, in order to have much force for magickal purposes.

Hypothetically I can imagine someone who has fully assimilated all consequences of subjective idealism and solipsism (which is a specific way to utilize subjective idealism), and has eliminated all contrary beliefs and their associated mental habits, *can indeed* perform arbitrary manifestations even just to test or prove things, or for very spurious and frivolous reasons. That's because the resistance to intent in this case will be virtually zero, and you're essentially in a fully-realized God mode then. But this is not nearly where I am personally at right now, yet.

> This formula makes a lot of sense to me, but from my experience I'm finding that changing a habit or a contradictory intent works by replacing or reframing said habit/intent rather than removing it.

I agree totally. I hope I didn't create any impressions to the contrary. Furthermore, I find that before I can reform a contradictory intent it helps to *understand* it first. All intentional states serve some purpose. For me personally I find I have to acknowledge that purpose and then I have to either decide that I no longer need some purpose to be served, *or*, find a *new* way to serve the same old purpose, that will not contradict my magickal intentionality going forward.

So for example, a big reason why I was a physicalist to begin with, is the sense of rock-solid stability and predictability I would feel about myself and the world. So let's say I want more flexibility, but I still want stability. Then I can't just *blindly* throw away physicalism. I have to find new sources of stability first. Then I have to gradually lean on those sources and see if they're reliable. If yes, I can begin relaxing around my prior physicalism. So it's a gradual process and one with a lot of self-respect instead of self-bashing. So even though I recognize I was doing things in a substandard way in the past, I should realize that those old ways still had a reason and I wasn't a *complete* idiot in the past. :) Just somewhat foolish, or maybe even not so foolish. Maybe my priorities have changed and now I need a new worldview that better suits those priorities.

So for me it's a process of gradual understanding of oneself that I believe allows one to relax around the old patterns and reform those patterns into some more suitable newer ones. Contradictory intentionality can be tricky because so much of it is below the level of consciousness, so before I can understand it, I have to be aware of it to begin with. So much of my own effort is directed at becoming maximally aware of all the activity in my own mind. In this it's been my experience that it helps to combine passive observation with playful experimentation. This is where the magick comes in. Just sitting quietly and observing I will not learn all there is to know about myself. I have to observe myself in action, during striving, and not just when I am passive or relaxing. It's particularly instructive when I am striving in some unconventional or beyond-conventional manner too. Again, magick.

> We might be saying the same thing here with different syntax.

It's starting to look that way.

> And as concise as you think you are sometimes it's not enough and these discussions help dispel that.

I agree. What I say is not perfect. I mean, I myself find problems with my earlier articles (especially if they're really old). Plus, I have a tendency to assume everyone is on the same page as me, so I speak in a kind of

shorthand that often assumes too much. On the other hand, I have to speak imperfectly, because if I start to explain every last element of the surrounding context I won't even get to say anything.

So I say something that's not 100% right, then you say something else, then I reply, and eventually something emerges that's better compared to if you didn't say anything.

I am glad for your replies. I think you're speaking in a very constructive and helpful way.

> Magick is a bespoke artform.

Well said.

mindseal – Everything is incredibly powerful.

I just want to alert your attention to the fact that there is no such as anything that's powerless. Every tiniest thought has power. Every breath has power. Every sigh has power. I won't even say anything about magickal intentionality, rituals, punches, written articles, and wars. Even glancing at someone has power. You cannot avoid power. The right attitude for anyone seeking self-mastery is to begin recognizing the power that you have and *constantly* exude, and begin taking responsibility for it, and stop pissing your power away in ineffective, pointless, useless and self-defeating causes. I won't tell you what those causes are. You have to figure this out for yourselves.

Let's consider a metaphor here and why many people get confused about the effectiveness of small alterations.

Suppose there is a 1000 lbs barbell laying on the floor. Let's also suppose it has square sides instead of the circular ones, so it cannot roll. Now suppose I am a weak child, 5 years of age. Now suppose I were to strain myself against the barbell by pulling it upward. Obviously the barbell won't move. So *if you go by visible appearance*, you'll *wrongly* conclude my action had no effect. If another person were to stand there and begin pulling they would no longer need to pull the entire 1000 lbs upward, but it would be 1000 lbs *minus* whatever my 5 year old self is contributing in the pull. In other words, nothing of that action got lost! Every tiny action has an effect.

Properly repeated (with good timing) actions have their effect applied according a principle of resonance by combining with the habitual energy of the past such actions.

So the point is, even if you don't see anything change as a result of your intent, it doesn't mean your intent just vanished or wasn't effective. Rest assured all your intentionality is absolutely *supremely* effective. Everything you do and don't do matters. How often you do it matters to. With what attitude you do it matters. The mood matters. Your understanding matters. Everything matters. There is nothing that doesn't matter. If you believe something doesn't matter, then that belief begins to matter and takes effect, but only because that's the state of mind you're in at the time.

So don't right away judge whether you succeed or fail by simply naively observing the outward appearances. You have to go beyond the appearance to start cultivating inner power. Eventually you may start seeing obvious results too. Just like someone can eventually learn to lift that 1000 lbs barbell but they may first only get a visible result with a 50 lbs barbell.

So if you don't see an effect it doesn't mean there isn't one.

It is an immutable mental law that *all* intent has an effect.

It's often hard to say exactly what kind of an effect because to say this you need to know the specifics of your own mentality, but you can be sure it has *some* effect, always.

mindseal – Interesting possible relationship between knowledge, volition and experience.

While talking with /u/AesirAnatman I realized something I think is interesting, so I'm going to put it here. I often talk about mind as a threefold capacity to know, to experience and to will.

I always see all three as inseparable, such that there is no volition without knowledge and experience, no experience without volition and knowledge and so on.

Then it occurred to me that a magickal way of operation uses knowledge as input into volition, and produces experience as output.

Whereas a status quo or conventional way of operation uses experience as input into volition and produces knowledge as output.

mindseal – A simple healing tactile visualization.

Your innermost heart is brilliant beyond brilliance and steady beyond steady. It is calm. It is perfectly poised. It is all-capable. It is invincible. It is a repository of all possible virtue and all possible health. You can consider this proposition in a lively manner, without any dead rote, but really considering it sincerely as if hearing it for the first time each time you consider it.

As you do so, you can hold your two hands together and put them comfortably in front of you. It's essential to deliberately focus on the softest and mildest feelings. Something subtle can be very powerful. A whisper of a feeling can overwhelm something that roars when you feed it with your attention and love. So as you hold your two hands together, feel the softness and kindness of your left hand seep into your right, and the softness and kindness of your right hand seep into your left. There is no need to make it a strong feeling. The key for this type of exercise is subtlety. It can be a subtle but very distinct and noticeable feeling. It may start to feel warm and comfortable, and soft kindness will glow in your hands.

When soft kindness glows in your hands, you can allow it to gradually expand by feeling the very same thing you feel in your hands all over your body. When this happens remember your true innermost heart. Consider how invincible, calm, steady your innermost heart is. It is like the starry sky at night. There is no agitation in it at all, and it is your innermost core.

mindseal – Not all manner of relaxation is of equal benefit.

For the purpose of this article I'll define two types of relaxation:

1. Physicalistic relaxation.
2. Unconventional relaxation.

Physicalistic relaxation is what happens when ordinary beings relax. Ordinary beings have entrenched habitual ideas about themselves, the world, what is real and what isn't, the relation of themselves to the world and so on. They think the mind comes from the brain. They think the body is who they are. They think the body lives in a material universe. Their minds are full of these ideas and *these are not just ideas, but they are a way of life*, they are ingrained mental habits which occur effortlessly and tacitly. Therefore, when ordinary beings relax, the state of relaxation merely brings them to that which is habitual: to that whole host of relatively bad metaphysical assumptions about one's body, one's own mind, the world, and the relation between the three. This is what I call physicalistic relaxation. From a subjective idealist POV phyiscalistic relaxation can be called a deluded or a constrained relaxation. This is the kind of relaxation that all the people get on the couch while watching football, while playing the piano or guitar, while reclining in the garden and so on... This is why relaxation of the ordinary beings doesn't make them enlightened but simply refreshes and maintains ignorance.

Now then, there is another kind of relaxation. It is the relaxation of a peer. The peer has thoroughly and repeatedly reviewed and mentally relaxed all the constraining ideas about one's body, the mind, the world. In some cases the peer may have abandoned some such ideas altogether. For example, the peer does not think the mind comes from the brain or from anything else. Does not think the world is inside, outside, temporary, eternal, non-existent, existent, made of substance, etc. Does not think that the human body is inside the world or the world is inside the human body or that the human body and the world are identical. Does not think of oneself as identical to the body or different from it. Subjective idealism provides a reliable theoretical foundation for this radical change in mentality. The peer doesn't rest in some anti-intellectual vacuum, far from it, but instead intellectually understands why and how the constraining conceptions of physicalism can be discarded on the basis of reason. And it's not merely thinking in these ways that's been abandoned, but also all attendant habits and intuitions have been relaxed and in some cases abandoned as well. Now, when this type of being relaxes, something extraordinary happens. The universe of appearances resolves into mystery and there is nothing but clear light of wisdom, omniscience, the universal womb. This is what I call the unconventional relaxation. This sort of relaxation is liberative. It's not ordinary. It confers not only insight but all kinds of superknowledges and special abilities to the person and it is not for the feint of heart because after all, the universe becomes undone, never mind your personal being as you would typically conceive of it, or your family, or all the rest.

[...]

> [A: I think for those of us wriggling our way out of convention and into unconventionality, 'conventional relaxation', like 'conventional (a lot of things)' can potentially do a little more than just refresh and maintain ignorance. E.g. I think some creative arts and expressions can qualify as 'conventional relaxation' but can actually serve to dismantle and weaken certain conventional patterns.]

I agree. I am generalizing. I am pointing to the fact that people relax all the damn time and almost none of them ever become liberated from anything conventional. There are tons of artists but only few Alan Moores and Austin Osman Spares, etc.

That said, I'll edit the article, gladly, if you can find a smoother way to get this across.

> [A: So I am not uniformly against all those things that might fall under the umbrella of 'physical relaxation'. I am against them when they're carried out with a highly physicalist mentality, but I'm against anything carried out with such a mentality.]

Neither am I. I never said what is beneficial and what isn't. :) I only said that the benefit is not equal. Sometimes you may want to deliberately fall into a conventional mode of relaxation because you like the convention you've developed for yourself. It becomes a problem when you forget that this sort of relaxation is *just one way to relax*. There are deeper and trickier ways to relax too. That's what I was trying to get across.

mindseal – Comparing the weird way to other traditions is a big mistake.

There have been a couple people who've expressed to me an idea that, roughly, "it's all the same, all the wisdom traditions point to the same thing, blah blah." This is a PSA that while the weird way may share some or even a lot of commonality with some or many spiritual traditions, it is *not* in fact exactly the same. Please don't hamstring the weird way by *overly* identifying it with Buddhism or Hinduism or Thelema or Gnostic Christianity or what have you.

So what makes the weird way different from most traditions?

I would put it as follows:

1. The weird way is not a creed, but an area of study. You don't follow it. The weird way isn't a path to follow. It's an area of study. You study it. Of course studying it has some implication to life. So in a sense you may also be following some path, but everyone follows their own path.

It's like everyone is using mathematics at the cash register, but they're not all buying the same things. *The weird way is like mathematics.* You can study it and when you study it, you'll of course be more likely to read and enact your experience in weird ways, but what exactly that ends up meaning will not be exactly and precisely identical for everyone. Some people want to swallow the blue bill.

The blue pill is expressed in Buddhism as "chop wood, carry water." It means post-enlightenment you have the same shit life as before, but now you can be proud and happy about it, like a moron. The modern version of this would be "Q: What's after enlightenment? A: Wage slavery!" Hahahaha.

Others want a radical change. And everything in between. It's like some people go lucid in a dream only to follow the dream without changing anything. To me it's a waste of lucidity, but if they're enjoying it, they can still be lucid while allowing deep habits to roll onward as status quo.

So unlike with religion, where everyone pretends to strive toward the same exact teleology, I like to think we don't do that. We do not all head toward the formless realm or nirvana or heaven or the jade palace or parallel Earth #529304. However, what I think we should have in common is that we're *aware* of our personal teleology. We dream with awareness, with purpose, with courage or even fearlessness, not mindlessly like zombies. There is no prescribed or thought-to-be-ideal routine and no conventional and weird-approved lifestyle. That's quite different from most religions where you have to show up certain days and do certain things, and where they do make rather specific demands on your lifestyle, such as do this, and don't do this, etc. We don't do that. So here there are no 10 commandments and no 5 precepts like in Buddhism, not formally anyhow, etc.

So again, it's like in mathematics. You learn how the numbers relate, but what should you calculate? How many calculations per day should you do? Should you start your mornings with 5 minutes of 1+1=2? Right? It's nonsense. Mathematicians understand the abstract nature of their discipline, and so do we.

And abstract doesn't mean "unreal" btw, to any crypto-physicalists who might by chance be reading this. Abstract is the only reality, whereas all that's concrete is illusory. In fact partial and incomplete abstractions

are still somewhat concretized and are somewhat illusory. Only the ultimate abstraction is actually real and not any lesser ones.

This brings me to my second point.

2. The weird way is based on an *unapologetic* and *thoroughgoing* **subjective idealism**. *Subjective* means personal perspective is fundamental to everything we study and do. In this we're different from just about 99% of all the world's traditions who attempt to prescribe a standard and thought to be "correct" set of the experiences you "ought" to have.

We're even in some cases different from Buddhism, which is supposed to be subjective but isn't always sure that it is, so most Buddhists are quite confused about it, and the Buddha was never explicit about it that I know of. I can't remember a Pali Canon Sutta where Buddha expounds the thoroughly subjective nature of experience and knowledge and action, and I've read a lot of them in translation. The Buddha was effectively talking about subjectivity and perspectivalism, but never directly and by name as we do it here. And he created a dogmatic and religious structure, with good intentions, no doubt, but it all went south as you can see if you look at Western Zen where most so-called "masters" are physicalists, which in Buddhist lingo means they're Ucchedavadins, which means they're actually anti-Buddhist, since Buddhism doctrinally flatly rejects Ucchedavada. But I digress.

So religion is basically a flawed way to try to force people to do the right thing, and it doesn't work. Even when the best person and a genius such as Buddha starts a religion, invariably it turns to absolute shit. Hell, even Buddha knew that in advance! That's why the Buddha has predicted the eventual downfall of his dispensation, lol. No shit. So over here we don't even bother trying that. It's not worth it. Dogmas stultify the mind, and to study the weird way you need a brutally *sincere* mind and an *agile* mind, which are qualities dogmas destroy.

So we're *unapologetically subjective* in our mind-is-all approach. Our mind-is-all approach is not just of epistemological variety, which is weak. It's *both* epistemological *and* ontological. It's a very strong, assertive, and frankly, dangerous approach. It's dangerous because it's capable of producing *great changes quickly*. It's like you're being handed live katanas here, and if you don't watch it, there go your ears and nose, oops. Watch where you swing that thing! This thing is a real live weapon folks. It's not just effective. It's *fucking* effective. It's *that* effective. You can dissolve your human body into a rainbow or land in a psychiatric ward, or *both* at the same time. And that's how it *should* be. If it wasn't like this, it would be weak sauce.

So, as it happens, once you realize all is fundamentally epistemologically and ontologically mind, and here I mean mind as a primordial tri-capacity to know, to experience, and to will, there is a lot you can do with it. It's like in mathematics. Once you realize what quantification is, there is so much diverse and different stuff you can do with a numerical approach. Some people use numbers to study the commonly observed visual shapes. Other people use quantification to study *spaces* that don't even exist conventionally and I do mean spaces and not any specific shapes that could occur in such spaces. Some people use math at the cash register. And for some people maths is a way to commune with the divine, and nothing less. So some have a very mundane and low-brow way to use math, and I *personally* do not respect such people. But as far as the weird way is concerned, we can't fault them because numbers are numbers, and if you're correctly using "all-is-mind" and "subjectivity is fundamental" approach at the cash register, you're *some* kind of a user of the weird way, perhaps a shitty one that I don't want to hang with personally, but still.

So please check your proclivity toward objectification at the door! We're not like that other tradition X, where some neutral common ground is acknowledged. Stop comparing us in a naive and blind way.

I like to imagine there is some room for *intelligent* comparisons that do justice to both sides of whatever is being compared. You can compare Gnostic Christianity to the weird way in a way that respects both, without reducing one to the other and without the pretense that all humans throughout history have pointed out the same truth and we're all going to sing kumbaya together, going to the same happy place together. Stop that dumb bullshit here please. You can do that bullshit somewhere else. Take it to your favorite religious or spirituality oriented sub and *tell them* how all traditions are the same, if they want to hear of it. But please don't bring it here. I like occasional intelligent comparisons but not bullshit "everything is the same" attitude of ignorance.

But Zen master X said ego is bad and needs to be dissolved. No. Fuck Zen master X. We don't give the slightest of fucks about what Zen master X said. Get it? We don't care. *We study subjective idealism and the implications of that on cognition.* Which is to say, we dream. We dream. We dream. We're not afraid to dream. We're not ashamed to dream. We're dreamers here.

mindseal – Egalitarianism, elitism, and symmetry vs asymmetry in a worldview.

I've been bumping up against this rock for a while now, and again it's come up in today's contemplation for me. There is a funny contradiction in my mind. On one hand, I love egalitarianism. I'm always and ever campaigning for the average Joe and Jill, so to speak. I oppose all kinds of elitism, and not just the wealth type, but even the intellectual type. Where do you think my anti-jargon stance comes from? It's not an accident. It's because I oppose intellectual elitism and I believe knowledge belongs to the people. One way to make sure knowledge is open to all is to speak with as little jargon as possible, and I always deliberately strive in that manner. My anti-elitist tendencies impact my life decisions in other ways as well. So in other words, it's not just a small thing or wishful thinking. It's how I live my life in some significant and hard to ignore respects. So egalitarianism and symmetry is a huge deal for me on some level.

The basic principle of symmetry as I am discussing it here is: whatever I apply to others, or the universe as a big "The Other", is what I also must apply to myself, and the other way around. If I apply something to myself, I have to apply it to others and/or to The Other. This perspective is aligned with egalitarianism.

But there is one tiny little problem. If I want to see myself as a ground of being, then I fundamentally can't equate myself to anything that manifests within me. This perspective introduces a profound asymmetry and on a relative level, when I practice this, it inclines me toward the elitist tendencies.

I've been noticing that recently I am often happy to leave people to wallow in their ignorance while being fully content to be wise myself. Before I would never be able to rest easy until I share my wisdom so that everyone has an equal "amount" of wisdom. So if I see someone saying truly dumb things, normally I would feel obligated to correct this, *not at all* because of any sense of superiority, but the opposite, from a sense that if I can understand it, so can they, and if I deserve to know something, so do they. So out of a sense of egalitarianism I would bend over backwards to try to explain everything I understand and to correct as many opinions I considered were painfully clumsy and inferior. That's because I thought if wise opinions are like wealth, then the wealth should not be hoarded.

This is also why I've been opposing the various secret societies and similar type organizations. I saw and probably still see them as knowledge hoarders. They're greedy for knowledge and they don't share it equally.

But recently I've been finding myself being very comfortable in letting people wallow in their ignorance. I no longer feel as strongly as before that I must share everything I know. Sometimes I even think, oh the horror, fuck it, maybe I am just wiser and maybe others aren't meant to know what I know. When I think I am inherently superior, that's when it's very very easy for me to just smile when I read something I consider dumb, and not bother replying or making a comment. Then I get a sense that wisdom isn't meant to be for the other person. We're not equal and aren't meant to be equal. When I feel this way, I have zero desire to engage other people, especially if I think they're wrong or stupid.

In general if I am to exercise a creative principle at large, I can't apply the same principles to myself and to the world. I have to practice asymmetry. So for example, the world is created, but I am not. The world arises and passes, but I do not. The world is the surface of the will, but I am its core. When I bind the world to a set of

laws, I myself don't have to bind myself to the same set, and indeed, it's better if I don't if I intend to exercise a huge amount of influence.

And you better believe even the tiniest things are huge from a metaphysical perspective. For example, even raising the body temperature is in some ways against the law of thermodynamics. But it's beyond that. Even if I thought the world was a living organism, that wouldn't be enough to control my body's temperature reliably. What if I will my temp to rise, but the mother Earth or forest spirits will it to fall? So just switching from physicalism to animism doesn't grant me a sufficient scope for many of the kinds of transformations I want to be able to manifest even at a tiny scope (in and closely around the human body say). But I don't stop at a tiny scope. Tiny scope is called "tiny" for a reason.

So in the long term I fear I will become the elite that I loathe now. I will discard symmetry and use asymmetry all over the place. And my days of fighting for the common person are probably nearing their end as well. In some ways this feels sad. In some ways I also think that common people deserve their fates, because they collectively have the power to change the whole world, and if they don't, then they deserve to live with the consequence. So fuck the common man and woman. Collectively they get what they want to get. Enough of them are greedy and property oriented to keep the whole game of capitalism afloat. Why should I help any of them? If you order a fish at a restaurant and you happen to get a fish, you can't complain. That's how I've been feeling lately and it should be obvious I can't say everything I want to say in such a short post.

mindseal – Why generally enlightened people suck, but enlightenment is amazing.

For the purpose of this post I am defining enlightenment as a kind of practico-theoretical dream wisdom in line with what we're discussing here on this sub.

First, substance. One way to define substance is to say it is that which allows observation from multiple perspectives. And the corollary to this is that if we say things lack substance, we are saying things appear as they appear to a single perspective, yours, and whatever other perspective observes, is not the same thing at all. Or in effect, you're not observing things! You are observing only the emanational consequences of your own commitment. Because a different perspective will involve a different commitment (the total state of one's volition, conscious and unconscious regions thereof), they observe something almost entirely unique.

So when I see a chair, I am looking at a consequence of my own commitment rather than some external object. Therefore when someone else observes a chair what actually happens is that I observe both the chair and the someone else, and I myself grant that the someone else has a valid narrative input on the chair. But all this is 100% internal to my point of view. If I were to grant true being to external observers, I would no longer have the authority to take their narratives as informative, because I would then not be able to tie up all the loose ends myself. Ironic.

Now what about perspectives themselves? Can these be said to have substance? Again, how can one's perspective be observed externally? If you realize that you're always observing consequences of your own commitment, then you know you're not observing something called "Nefandi's perspective." My perspective is my way of relating all things, but that's only knowable to me. To see something called "Nefandi" from the outside you have to have *your own* way of relating things where Nefandi is but one tiny element of a bigger network, so the Nefandi you know is not whatsoever the Nefandi that I know. The Nefandi I know is my way of relating all things. It is my subjectivity itself in its generality and specificity. But the Nefandi you know is just some sensory phenomenon, and nothing more. Those are two very different "things."

That's the background. It's the plate.

Now the fried potatoes that go on that plate.

Your own enlightenment is partway realization and partway practical perfection of that same realization as it occurs inside your own perspective. This by its very nature will make things better for you. You will become less dependent on society and on circumstances as a result. You will become less influenced by praise and blame. You will become less controllable, which is good for you. And how this feels on the inside you can only know once you get "there." In fact no one can even know if you got "there" or not, it's something only you know (or decide).

But looooong before you reach a decent level of enlightenment you are guaranteed to *fantasize about enlightenment as a remote possibility*. When you fantasize about enlightenment as a remote possibility you imagine *other people* "out there" are enlightened. That's the sensory symbolic representation of your own future enlightenment. But this imagination *by necessity* is based on a gross misunderstanding of enlightenment! You're imagining all this while in the throws of gross ignorance. Thus *all* the so-called

"enlightened people" are nothing but hopes of a feverishly ignorant mind. And those hopes are just wrong in so many ways, but you won't know how or why until you're a long way into the process yourself, and then you'll start to realize how stupid you were for thinking Buddha or Zhuangzi or anyone else (I do mean *anyone*) were even remotely enlightened. Such suggestive sensory phenomena accompanied by narratives are *nothing but* the products of your own pre-enlightened (read: largely ignorant) perspective. These fragments can *never* be enlightened (nor can they be ignorant or unenlightened, lol, they're just not anything specific at all, but they're helpless victims of whatever dark pre-weird dream you're having).

Put another way, your own enlightenment is your own idealization of the best way of being. Whereas other people's enlightenment is your own idealization of the best possible way you can be treated by an (believed to be) external being. These can *almost never* be the same thing.

So for example, if I am always insecure, the best thing I can imagine from an ordinary point of view is to be surrounded by people who constantly boost my confidence and put winds in my sails. So I then might imagine how people who do this flawlessly are enlightened. Why? Because that's what a perfect servant would be. An externally enlightened person is a perfect servant of myself. They boost my confidence when I am insecure. They chastise me when I get reckless thus saving me from accidents. They feed me when I am hungry, even selflessly sacrificing their bodies to feed me. They present their wisdom in the form of entertaining and easily digestible tales. They teach me how I can become stronger in a step by step manner tailored to my needs. These folks take the time to familiarize themselves with the peculiarities of my unique ignorance so that they can speak to me in a way that will connect with me. So that's the ideal of an external enlightenment.

External enlightenment is a servant of all your flaws. You're insecure, so external enlightenment is there to dote on you. You're becoming reckless and mindless and external enlightenment is there to put the breaks on you so you don't have to do so yourself. You're bored, and external enlightenment is there to entertain you all the while also giving you spiritual calories that are good for you. Basically the idea of external enlightenment is someone who is totally your bitch. They exist totally for you. They have no self interest because it's a full time job to serve your interest.

But what about internal enlightenment? Does anyone really dream of becoming a slave? Think about it. Do you want to become more free or more bound? Do you want to have more obligations or fewer? Do you want more options in your life or fewer options? Do you want a greater scope for your volition or a narrower scope?

Also consider this. *If everyone* reached perfection in terms of an external enlightenment ideal, who would be the beneficiary? The whole point of external enlightenment is that you serve those who are less enlightened than you. But if everyone is equally 'external-ideal' enlightened, whom do they serve? They're like slaves without a master. They fall by the wayside. The ideal of external enlightenment is basically a dead end. The ideal of external enlightenment requires ignorant and spiritually inadequate people to be valid. A bottle cap requires some bottle to be a cap of. Without the bottles bottle caps are just piss poor tiny tea cups or something. Probably just landfill.

Internal enlightenment has no such flaws. Once you become internally enlightened you become liberated in every sense of the word. You no longer depend on any specific scenario to be useful. You can create and abolish any scenarios. You can be useful to yourself and to others and even to other internally enlightened people (enlightened according to an internal ideal), and if there are no people at all, you can still be useful to

yourself. You know how to keep yourself happy. It's an endlessly resourceful and endlessly rich state of being. It leads toward infinity. You're nobody's and nothing's slave. This is something very scary to normal people. Think about it.

Imagine a friend who feels no pain. Can you trust this friend to understand your pain? Can you trust that this friend will play nice with you? We as conventional people *need* others who are tightly bound by ignorance and fear. And the ideal of external enlightenment is the very pinnacle of such bondage. Not only do externally enlightened people feel our pain and understand our ignorance, they become absolute servants of that pain and ignorance, always patient, always polite, always available. They become a salve on our pain for us. They are selfless because we are selfish. They become salves because we have wounds we don't know how or don't want to heal. These externally enlightened people feel our pain even more severely than we ourselves feel it. They're total bitches. Total slaves. They throw their lives totally in the direction of my desires. They're polite because they know how easily my tiny ego is injured. They never show too much wisdom or strength around me because they know how depressed I will be if I see other people better than myself. They must hide their virtues to make me feel good. That's the ideal of external enlightenment. And this ideal permeates this dream in a very profound way *if* you're someone who *needs* to encounter external enlightenment.

Once you have a halfway decent inner recognition you will no longer want to encounter external enlightenment. Then all your perceptions and conceptions will change radically. You'll realize once and for all that what feels good to be and what feels good to be done to are often two different things. Internal enlightenment is profoundly selfish. You cannot become enlightened for anyone or anything else. Making your own perspective internally perfect will only be noted as "perfect" internally to your own perspective, duh. And nowhere else. You can't impress upon a truly external perspective something of your own perspective. It's not even theoretically possible.

So all those private buddhas are the real deal, while the lone self-sacrificing Buddha who shares with everyone, that's only a student. :) It's also an anomaly. It's rare. But that doesn't mean it's good. It's not just diamonds that are rare. Stillborn are also rare. When there is a smoothly functioning process rare is that which fails the process. If enlightenment is a smoothly functioning process in the mind, then stand-outs from that process are probably failures. So if most Buddhas are pacceka (private) Buddhas, then probably that's what's healthy and good. And the lone Buddha that deviates is somewhat broken. And of course there is some benefit and usefulness from being somewhat broken, but it's still broken from a greater perspective. And in any case, if you think someone is enlightened, it's pretty much a guarantee that you're wrong. Once you get halfway toward internal enlightenment you will no longer think or even care about who is or isn't enlightened. You won't need a symbol of hope "out there." You'll only care about making your own dream better, and nothing else. And no, other people won't necessarily like that about you. But you won't care and besides, you can emanate a crowd of sycophants anyway, if that's your style, if you want that sort of ornament in your dream, but you know you ain't playing fair anymore. You know there is no such thing as "objectively deserving" sycophants. **There is nothing fair or nice about freedom unless it's you who is free.**

mindseal – The outside is generally not a reflection of the inside.

There is this popular conception that floats around, and I think it's often an incredibly damaging one. The idea is that whatever you are like on the inside somehow spreads out and infects the outside or it somehow gets mirrored in the external world.

So for example, if you're generous, that somehow infects other people with generosity and forces them to be generous to you back. Or if you're constantly fair when dealing with the others it in some way obliges others to be fair when dealing with you.

I don't think this is true in most cases. Why not? Because we generally emanate beings through the veil of othering. We generally will want those beings to appear truly unique and independent and therefore quite intentionally and on a very profoundly deep level we would *not* want those beings to be mere mirrors of our own conventional being. So we get a situation where not everyone is going to be generous even if you are. Not everyone is going to be fair even if you are.

The only way to make sure that people appear in some specific configuration, and mirroring is a *very specific* configuration, is to intend it directly from a very deep place in your being, without any hidden counter-desires messing things up (so this state of mind has to be very internally coherent). If you intend people to be mirrors and not to be free agents, then and *only then* will people begin being mirrors. I claim most people will *not* enjoy this style of emanation. Generally people want surprises, diversity and some degree of discord to make for a believable appearance of unique individuals as opposed to clones. Who wants to live in a sea of clones who copy every one of your "good" habits? On the other hand, we also wouldn't want to live in an environment where we're constantly brutalized no matter what.

This idea that what appears externally is a copy of what appears internally is potentially dangerous. In most cases it is a gross simplification, it's a distorted caricature of a greater truth. If people don't understand how gnarly and profound their own intentionality is and begin expecting a simplistic system of clones and mirrors when on some subconscious level they vehemently don't want to live among clones and mirrors, there is going to be a lot of unhappiness.

What's going to happen is, you'll be nice and you'll expect reciprocation. Any time someone fails to reciprocate you'll either get angry like "damn I was nice, now it's your turn, what the fuck?" Or you'll get depressed like "woa, I was nice and why isn't it working? Why isn't my niceness being cloned how I expect it to be? Why isn't everyone just a copy of my personality here? Damn it... nothing works.... it's all screwed." Or you'll begin to get very demanding and pushy with yourself like this "OK so I was nice but that wasn't cloned as I expected. So it means I must have been a dick on some subtle level. Damn, I suck. Why can't I be *really* nice??!!! If I am really nice, for sure that's going to become cloned all over the world. For sure. I need to try harder. I am not doing well enough. If I were, it would be visible externally." Etc.

So there are all these myriad of ways to get wrapped up and to hurt yourself and others because you misunderstand something very secret and deep inside yourself: you *generally* do *NOT* want to live in a sea of clones and do *NOT* want to live in a world of mere mirrors. You intend a complex world and you get a complex world. You're a Buddha but not everyone around you is a Buddha. You're nice but not everyone

around you is nice. Etc. It's a complex world because generally in most cases that's what you'd want: a complex, gnarly, strange, twisted, surprising, living breathing world where you can get lost, where you don't know everything in advance, etc.

I say "generally" because for a trained and very wise practitioner it will indeed be possible to emanate a sea of clones and mirrors and anything else! You could emanate some truly bizarre and common-logic-defying worlds. You could emanate a deliberately simple and deliberately symmetrical world. You could emanate a world with 3 body types and 2 personality types. So the possibilities are there, but you have to check yourself: is this where your heart is at? Do you expect a gnarly complex unpredictable world? Do you expect beings to look and smell and walk and talk like they have free will? Don't fool yourself no matter what it is. Whatever your deepest intent is, you have to meet that intent face to face if you want to achieve mastery of emanation.

A typical person who hangs around here is not interested in a world of clones and doesn't have the intentionality or the wisdom to pull something like that off. No you cannot just pretend everyone is a Buddha and force everyone to become a Buddha that way. That's not going to work assuming on a much deeper and more hidden level you want to encounter genuinely unique and surprising beings who seem to have their own quirks and interests in mind, sometimes even conflicting interests to your own.

Generally when we want to get lost in a world, we want that world to seem complex and not too predictable. If everything was just a mirror image of your conventional human personality it would be a small and boring world and we wouldn't even find it believable or worth getting lost in. There might be some exceptions to this, but I think in most cases what I say holds. I know for sure I don't want people to just be clones of me. That doesn't mean I don't want people to reciprocate. That's not the point. I want to feel like reciprocation is an option and not a given. If I feel it's not automatic, that creates the illusion of free will in the othered space, which generally speaking is very desirable.

Plus, if I am only doing something nice because I expect it to bounce back on me, I am not really being nice, am I? I am being self-serving. And if I want to be self-serving, I have more honest and *more direct* ways of serving my interests as an aspirant. I don't have to get other people involved in my self-serving trickiness by demanding that the other people invariably bounce everything back to me like helpless clones.

The world is a reflection of one's fullest and deepest commitment but one's fullest commitment is generally very complex. If you don't respect that complexity you're going to get snagged. I described how one can get snagged above, but there are many ways to get snagged besides the ones I described. Only people who properly understand the true and full depth of their own intentionality are free from being snagged by their own tacit secret commitments.

mindseal – What solipsism means to me, and why I believe it is a powerful and important view inside subjective idealism, even if it's optional.

Looks like solipsism is a topic of the hour, so this inspired me to share some of my thoughts on it. I *don't* often speak about solipsism *explicitly* and now is as good a time as any.

Firstly I want to clarify the definition of solipsism. It's possible I use a somewhat non-standard definition of "solipsism" and so just in case, it's a good idea to define the term. Solipsism to me means a unified *subjective* point of view. So it's both unified, as in, non-dual, not excluding anything as "other" or "out there" *and* subjective, as in, personal, perspectival, something to which other alternatives do exist. So an experience is subjective if it's perspectival. All experiences are perspectival. And something is perspectival if other alternatives exist. So for example, if I think events happen in time, since I can imagine events not happening in time, at least the conventional variety of time is optional in my consideration. So time is perspectival and subjective.

So what solipsism does *not* mean is something like "Everything is only Nefandi." That would be nonsense. I can experience any sort of identity or body. Because nothing *concrete* (specific) in my experience of myself is non-optional, when I unify my point of view, I am *not* unifying it under my conventional identity. Insofar Nefandi appears to me, so do say TriumphantGeorge, Utthana, and so on, at least, in this specific configuration of experience I am in now. So my view is unified in myself, but I am not strictly speaking Nefandi. I am experiencing Nefandi and to some extent you can say I am Nefandi-ing, but that isn't accurate, because in addition to Nefandi-ing I am also TriumphantGeorge-ing, street-ing, car-ing, cloud-ing, time-ing, space-ing, universe-ing, and so on. But it would be accurate to say that Nefandi-ing right now is at the forefront of my awareness and it often blinds me to other activity I am performing right now.

In most cases I positively *don't want* to be aware of this other activity, because I want it to happen on autopilot, on its own, without my *explicit* guidance. Which is to say, I want a breathing living game world to be inside of, however, it *is* a world I want to be able to adjust, or even eliminate, if it doesn't suit me. But so long as it is suitable, there is really no desire for micromanagement, and indeed, some amount of surprise is enjoyable in and of itself. In this way it makes good sense for me to hide certain "things" from myself even if those things are still just myself.

So why would any of this be interesting or relevant to me? The main reason is the *ability to perform complete transformations* and the development of personal confidence that extends all the way to the level of concrete manifestations (as opposed to say only confidence in the abstract nature of things).

I recall the most basic and most enjoyable moment of my lucid dreaming career, and like for many lucid dreamers, it's learning to fly. And how was I able to fly? I was able to fly only after I realized, thanks to lucidity, that everything I am witnessing is a mind-made world of my own creation. So my view in a lucid dream has become unified subjectively in myself. And this is what gave me certainty and knowledge that I could manifest the experience of flying. And voila, I was able to fly. The enjoyment and a sense of mastery from this experience is unforgettable. I want to learn to fly in all kinds of ways.

Flying bodily through the sky is just one kind of flying. Flying is a metaphor for experiencing without limitations. Normally there is a limitation of gravity. When you fly you remove the limitation of gravity on experience. In lucid flying I have realized that ultimately gravity in all the ways I experience and know it is a self-imposed habit of my own mind. Because this is so, I have *options* with regard to that habit. If I like it the way it is, I can keep it. I can also modify it or make it adjustable or even make it inconsistent in some way. Options abound.

When the viewpoint becomes unified and subjective, this does create a source of personal power. This, above all else, grants the power to direct experience in any way one may desire.

Of course, like anything, this modality has potential pitfalls. In particular, if you always satisfy every desire, you may start to lose tolerance to adversity. As the tolerance to adversity decreases, smaller and smaller intensity is required to create a sense of the experience being undesirable. So supposing I have a huge tolerance of pain, but I take care never to deliberately injure myself, after say 100 or 10000 subjective years of this, I *may* find even a feather against the skin feels like intolerable pain. And I am not saying this is a set in stone eventuality, but personally I do see this as a very likely possibility, assuming no arcane mental activity that would prevent ordinary habituation from working as usual.

On the other hand, overfocusing on tolerance one becomes passive and inexpressive. If you can tolerate anything perfectly, why live? Why sing if you can tolerate silence perfectly? Why write articles if you can tolerate ignorance? Why caress someone if you can tolerate absence of touch of a sentient being? Perfect tolerance removes any reason for anything at all. At the extreme of tolerance one just exists, as a mere insensate thing.

So I always develop myself in both directions. I learn to tolerate pain and adversity. But I also learn (or re-remember) to be extraordinarily expressive. To me this is what freedom is like: I don't have to do anything, but I also don't have to avoid doing anything. In other words, I am free in both directions. I am free in the direction toward greater and greater passivity. And I am free in the direction toward greater and greater activity or influence.

I think that ultimately all control is self-control. As a random aside, hypnotists like to say "all hypnosis is self-hypnosis," and one of the consequences of such a view is that when you hypnotize an audience, you are actually hypnotizing yourself into experiencing that you're hypnotizing the audience. And so self-hypnosis is always the first step for any hypnotist. Since solipsism doesn't train you to control something other than your own mind, I regard solipsism as the reader's birthright. Why? Because it's your birthright to learn to control your own mind to *an arbitrary* degree, *if* that's what you want to be learning, or remembering (since secretly you already know all there is to know anyway). In a way solipsism is the most modest position, since it's all only and ever about self-knowledge and self-control. For a solipsist adept, luckily, self-control implies all possible forms of control that actually matter in one's experience, but that's just a nice aside. The main driver for a genuine and sincere solipsist is not other-control, but self-control.

Th, th, th, that's all folks! :) At least that's all I wanted to say of my view on solipsism at this time.

[...]

> Tell a physicalist youre a solipsist and theyre going to have an entirely different thing in mind :)

Thing is, I don't bring up solipsism generally, but I get accused of it so often, I decided to own the term and run with it.

> [A: It's a fun idea. I wore it last night. Solipsism is absolutely the most terrifying position I've held. It forces you onto an entirely new dimension of freedom. That level of freedom isn't scary on its own. What's scary is self-doubt that creeps in that causes thoughts like: "What if I do batshit insane shit as a solipsist but then relapse back into physicalism and have to deal with the reality I've placed myself into, having to face what I've wrought. "
>
> Example: I decide to try out being a mafia gang leader because that sounds like fun. Fun in a dream; Maybe not as fun when you're a limited identity and death means the end.
>
> I suppose the next step is to say "so what" and make the leap to doing Whatever You Want Without Exception F u c k T h e F e a r.
>
> Hell, welcome the potential relapse back into physicalism! You know from your current solipsist perspective that even if worse comes to worse, it'll only be a TEMPORARY matter of perspective. A long, bad nightmare that'll soon end. That's the worst-case.]

Exactly. There are mental ways to challenge one's experiential reality that create minimal risk from the POV of physicalism, but still create huge internal risk. So it's 90% contemplation and 10% intelligent risk taking. Of course as the fear subsides and as one becomes more and more stable in living inside one's own mind as opposed to living in a notion of a world+body, some (mental) activity formerly perceived as risky becomes safe. Then one can expand again, intelligently.

This is what I recommend. I don't advise balls to the walls stunts 24/7. The process is mostly mental and there shouldn't be a need to do a lot of stunts that are "visible" from the POV of (imaginary) physicalist 3rd person perspectives. That said doing this does draw one into a magickal lifestyle bit by bit, and yes, at some point you just have to take responsibility no matter what. But if you've been going slow and steady while building an unshakeable and reliable foundation in your own mind, you're not going to have a major panic attack. By the time you get to a point where you're consistently doing something scary even from the POV of physicalism, pain and death will mean relatively little. Fear of death goes first. Then the fear of pain starts to go as you gain more control over the mind.

The secret inner guide knows best.

mindseal – Let's all stop pretending we don't want infinite power.

Some people get uncomfortable when we discuss the topic of power. Why do you think they are uncomfortable? I will tell you. They're uncomfortable because they think if you gain power, it will be at their expense! In other words, if someone here gains power, then someone with less power will suffer for it. So, a zero sum game of power. Of course preventing others from seeking power in order to retain more control over your own life is what? It's power-seeking just the same. Who are we foolin'? Right? Nobody is fooled. We all understand.

People with the biggest egos get upset when someone next to them has a big ego. Why so? Because if Bob's ego is so huge, there will be less of a spotlight for my own little but cute ego which needs some love. Would a selfless person mind someone else who had a huge ego? Of course not. What would be the point of minding if you have no personal needs or desires? Why would you comment on someone's ego or power if you had no similar needs yourself?

Unlike in the (illusory) material world, where by convention things often are a zero sum game, in the mental world things are not a zero sum game. In the mental world it's possible for 10,000 all-controlling Gods to meet and chat with each other, and not to step on each others' toes. If you don't think it's possible, I challenge you to consider that yes, it is possible, and unless you understand why and how it is possible, you have no business seeking more personal power.

So I understand very well the fears and insecurities around this topic. For some people just the theme of "all is mind" is a cause for intestinal hatred. Why so? Because it's a short distance from that to solipsism, and solipsism makes people afraid. And yet, solipsism is a very powerful and useful view to master.

Subjective idealism is not restricted to solipsism and indeed I act as though I respect (not to be confused with politeness) everyone, even though I know people are just dream emanations. Nonetheless, some of the most interesting and powerful experiences are only possible within a unified point of view, and this unified POV is basically solipsism, which is what many of you fear. It's fine if you don't want to benefit from unifying your POV. It's fine to hold it off. But don't knock it because one day when you get tired of convention, you may want to leave convention using the escape hatch of solipsism, and what will you do then, if you've built up layers and layers of fear and hatred around that idea? You'll be in trouble. You have to use the hatch, but it's overgrown with thorns. You don't want to be in that position, do ya? So you don't have to like solipsism, but be mindful not to bash it, for one day you may need to use it yourself.

mindseal – Reply to: Intention and Manifestation

In some sense there is no mechanism to will/intent. Mechanisms appear to matter because we have something we could call "stages" of intent. So for example, I intend to be in a certain city. That intent forms the context for further intentionality. Then once I am in that city, I can intend to be in a certain building. That's another stage. Once I am in that building, that becomes a further context for a more refined intentionality inside that building.

In real terms it's way more complex, because we start with some ground-level assumptions about reality. Those assumptions form the most basic context. That context is very abstract and we'll need to get to some deeper context to get to something concrete. Once we're dealing with some concrete things, we tend to think of mechanisms, because things often work like machines. So when we operate on things, we agree that "things are things", which is to say, we generally hold things as inviolable in meaning, so a rock is not also a butterfly, but is only a rock. Because a rock is held to only be a rock, it can be used as a machine with the simple and predictable functionality of a rock.

So this machine-like functionality is relevant because we're creating and mentally holding a layer of experience which resembles machinery.

So for example, look at the human body. Let's suppose you want to move your body forward. You have to move your left leg, then your right leg, then your left and so on. That's the mechanism of movement for a human body. But why does this mechanism exist? It's because you have a restricted pattern of a body, and you're the one who has restricted it that way. Because you do not forsake the restricting intent, your movement intent has to honor your restricting intent. Your body-restricting intent is the context within which you produce body movement intents.

But in general will is abstract. For example, do you really have to move your legs to move the body? No, you don't. You can teleport or hover or whatever. But normally you wouldn't allow yourself the luxury of that. :) It would seem crazy if you did that.

So suppose I want to make some clouds in the sky. Do I have to go through some steps? Is there a mechanism? No, there isn't. That's because I don't have to honor any restrictions. If I am meddling in the weather, I am already breaking the "normal" rules. So once I am OK with breaking the rules, I am also stepping beyond all the mechanisms.

All this is best understood via lucid dreaming. If you get good at lucid dreaming you can try doing magick in a lucid dream and it becomes obvious. You just directly will whatever you want and you don't have to go through any steps. But if you have a mental hangup, you may have to go through a step.

So for example, if I want to spawn a character, I could just spawn one. But if seeing something gradually or suddenly materialize is "too much" for my mind, I can imagine the new dream character as "already there" and then turn around to face them. So that's 2 steps, which is a kind of "mechanism." But this "mechanism" only exists so long as I have a hangup that prevents me from materializing character right under my nose.

> Q: Yes in this context I agree. It's 'shape-shifting' and deciding something is as you will it to be rather than setting up a mechanism which acts as a barrier. I still feel there needs to be a letting go

> of the beliefs which impede this direct path of WILL --> MANIFESTATION. You could say the letting go happens automatically because you override it by simply deciding that something is.

I agree. It's also gradual. As you rely on unconventional intentionality, it becomes easier and it gets normalized gradually. Also the corollary to there not being a mechanism for intent is that also, any mechanism can serve as the mechanism. So if you want to establish a mechanism, you can make it anything. As long as you use it consistently, it will become the mechanism for you in time.

> > Q: In this film, there is a room inside a dangerous/forbidden zone which only a "stalker" can guide you through, and when you walk into this room your deepest desires manifest into reality. But when the people being guided reach the room, they change their minds and decide not go in because they're afraid that their deepest desires might be nefarious and create unwanted circumstances, as some had experienced previously. This example shows how a lack of accountability can develop unconscious commitments that can create hangups. So being aware of this and taking responsiblity for your desires is one aspect.

I agree. So if this is what you mean by "a mechanism," then I agree. Although to my mind coming to terms with one's own desires is not by itself, a mechanical process.

> > Q: The other aspect is what I mentioned at the start, which is getting accustomed to the subtlety of intending without contradicting beliefs. "I will X to be"...

I agree. So yes, if you can regard these requirements you've listed as "the steps" then I suppose you can call this "the mechanism."

> > Q: I haven't experienced a time when I chose what I want to desire. What's your take on that? Would you say these are othered desires that are seeping through?

I examine my own desires. From that, it is often evident what else I could desire instead. Once I am aware of more than one option, then I have a choice. If I don't realize there is a different option, then I have an unconscious desire. But optionality is a spectrum: from no options, to one other option, to 2, to 3, to infinity. The more options I can see, the more aware I am of my choice. So seeing just 2 options is often a kind of rudimentary awareness which is not very aware, but it's better than seeing only 1 option.

I especially have a very strong incentive to examine my desires if something is stuck or is working in a painful/clumsy/grindy way. So a very basic example would be something like, "I want to find work." That's the starting point for contemplation.

Then:

"Where did I get this idea that I want to find work?"

"My mom and dad worked, so I was familiar with the concept since birth."

"Why do I want it?"

"It's how I can get money."

"Why do I want money?"

"I'll trade it for clothing, food, shelter, entertainment."

"Why do I need clothing?"

"I get cold, hot, wet."

"Is cold bad?"

"I experience it as bad, but maybe if I train, it won't be as bad."

"I trade money for medicine."

"What if I learn mind healing?"

"I trade money for things which make me look authoritative, like a suit, clean shave, cologne, etc."

"Is authority anchored in appearances or is there something deeper?"

"I trade money for entertainment."

"How can I entertain myself without the purchased tools?"

"I need money to buy people out, otherwise they lay claims to land and block my way."

"Can I undermine or restructure the land claims in some other ways?"

"What is work?"

"Work is when I go toward my purpose even despite difficulty."

"Then everything is work."

"Yes, it is."

"I need to distinguish work from working for hire."

"What is discipline?"

"I used to think it's what others demand of me. But now I know it's what I demand of myself. In fact when I resist other people's demands, that requires discipline."

Etc. etc. etc.

So after a thorough investigation into the nature of work, my desire for work is transformed. I see many ways I can work. Not just one. I am less beholden to whatever mom/pop thought was "work." I am more able to do my own thing and recognize it as work. So I do what I do without guilt, and because I don't have guilt, I cannot be cornered by a conservative, not even in principle, since I've undermined the emotional guilt button they would need to push in a typical conversation. So what opens up options is investigation of options. So for example, say long ago I thought work meant to build houses. Let's say I don't think that anymore, but in my mind I believe there are many people who still believe that. There's your othered desire. In this case it's my own old desire which was embraced by others. I've moved on, they haven't. That's just one example.

Another example is if I hold "the other" to be free-willed, to be capable of independently producing desires, then whatever novel desires they come up with, is this othered desire. Then if I make it my duty to serve this othered desire, I am living a life of trying to make my subconscious happy.

However, subconscious mind cannot be made happy if it's also allowed to be free. :) It's fickle when allowed freedom. So even if the subconscious is temporarily happy, it soon grows unhappy and makes new demands. Plus, when many people are granted unregulated and complete freedom, they often become at odds with one another, and I then end up getting stuck in the fights and disputations I don't want and may see as irrelevant.

So the way to be happy is to place one's own conscious mind above one's own unconscious. Which is the opposite of what the society teacher: "serve society!" Which means you have to serve your own subconscious while also not regulating it any. What is a slave? A slave is basically a servant of one's own subconscious mind.

So serving oneself while also minding societal happiness, is the best way. I have to mind, because societal appearances are included in my overall state of mind, so my happiness cannot ignore societal happiness. At the same time, I cannot be a slave and I cannot merely "serve" the subconscious, but on the contrary, I have to make my subconscious mind serve my conscious mind.

> Q: Well said and I can agree to all of that. This reminds me of something that's been discussed on here and other subs previously, which is, reality doesn't seem to have depth. It arises from awareness or the mind, but it is devoid of time or "space", and it can change completely in an instant. I used to think that it has a depth that's stored within a subconscious mind of some sort which acts as a blueprint, but even that is a concept of the mind and I allow it to be that way because that's what I believe.

I think the relative reality has momentum, which is like your concept of depth. However, the momentum that it has depends on your overall (conscious, subconscious and unconscious) volitional state and therefore is tunable. But people never think of tuning something like that since they think the relative reality exists independently as part of the seemingly independent environment "out there." (never mind that people often take the relative reality as ultimate, which is another mistake)

I don't neglect the manifestational momentum. Sometimes I actually want some patterns to gain momentum because I don't plan on micro-adjusting them every hour, so I want them to stay steady as a kind of "background." But sometimes some of the steady features get outdated and need to be refreshed, and at that time their steadiness gets in the way of tuning them, so sometimes I have to downregulate some types of momentum to make some patterns more susceptible to quick tuning.

>Q: So desire is something that exists as part of the human reality. "I am a human in this thing called a physical world which has X and Y cause and effect, and this human self desires more ideas to manifest into this physical world in a certain way etc..."

I don't believe that we are humans ultimately. Ultimately I am beyond species. I have the karma of a human, which is to say, my volitional makeup and my manifestational momentum support a human realm right now. But I am not permanently welded to this kind of state for all time. So deep down I am mind, and I ultimately can act as anything inside anything (so a human in a human realm, or a human in a dragon realm, or a dragon in a human realm, or a dragon in a dragon realm and so on ad infinitum).

> Q: When one cultivates a mentality that is beyond that of "I am this human here and this experience is happening to me." the context of experience broadens to an unimaginable degree from the perspective just outlined.

Very much so.

> Q: "Well if I am not only a human, to what extent am I?" This doesn't eliminate the human you may have imagined yourself to be from the experience, quite the contrary. It flips perspective to I am the experience happening to this human. Even that can be seen as a limited perspective because you can continue expanding from there to "I am the experience happening to all humans" all the way out to "I am."

I do not identify with any experience, but I *take responsibility* for all my experience. So I don't ID with it, but I AM *responsible* for it. That's the key to freedom. I see many people attempt to cut off their identification as a way to remove themselves from responsibility, which is the opposite of what I am doing. I detach my identify from the limited notions of myself so that I can *expand* my responsibility, not lower it. I am responsible for all of my experience and I am ultimately not limited in ways that a human would be limited by humanity/biology and whatever "human" things are ascribed to the humans. But of course there is the momentum inherent in having been humaning for so long too.

> Q: This quick tuning can be more desirable than starting from scratch

I agree. "Starting from scratch" would be a huge mental blow I think. I mean you have to start without the universe and separate light from dark and go through all the primitive steps, which is kind of pointless. I do want *some* kind of a universe, some stage, and it's easier to fix than to remake from scratch.

>Q: But with the idea of momentum it's much easier to adjust things because they aren't being expressed as one or the other, rather they are expressed as varying degrees of the same thing.

Yea, that's because in subjective idealism we hang onto our own meaning construction. Normally the person would imagine the meanings coming in from the outside. So a tree is already a tree by itself, through its own agency, and it just impresses its shape upon your sight and you're helpless but to recognize it only as a tree that is a tree that is a tree, etc. This is what it means to take appearances as informative. But over here we take appearances as suggestive rather than informative.

> Q: You can tune it by simply deciding rather than, say, going through a complex technique or magick ritual etc...

Exactly. But sometimes you may (optionally) want to deliberately limit your ability to decide if you notice you tend to decide haphazardly and carelessly at times (sometimes it only takes one bad decision to ruin something important), you may want to put a conceptual magickal "wall" between decisions and emanation so that only especially empowered decisions are allowed to affect something more than the body and the personal conscious mind. That's where the value of ritual may show itself, but for this one doesn't need ornate and elaborate rituals, but one just needs a special marker of some sort.

So I agree with you, but personally I have some degree of protection that would protect me from randomly deciding something that I think is "cool" on the spur of the moment and 1 hour later regret. In other words, I have deliberately somewhat constrained my ability to decide some things. I can still decide anything but if it's really important I have more hoops to jump through, and that's intentional.

And this has been liberating to me, because it means I can think freely, including having incredibly stupid thoughts, and I can think about what it would be like to decide some dumb things, and I never have to worry that my stupid thoughts will leak out and manifest at large. It's like having a manifestational scratch pad that's not intended as a work of art. On a scratch pad I can try stuff out only to throw it away. If I like how something looks on my scratch pad, I may bring it out more into the "external" sphere. Maybe if I could trust myself to never even need something like a scratch pad in the first place, I would simplify my internal mental setup even further, but until then I will keep my "wall."

> Q: What I was also getting at is that "desire" as you experience it in the context of being a human is not the same thing as volition, it's rather an experience. Volition is the act of deciding.

I completely agree. That's a very important point.

> Q: I feel I need to distinguish these two things because "desire" is aim without volition and is more akin to yearning/craving.

Exactly! That's also why imagination and thinking do not necessarily change manifestation. Only thought with intent to manifest has that power, not just any old random thought. I can think "let it rain" and I can think "let it rain" and intend for the rain to be my relative reality, and those two thoughts will "sound" the same in my mind, but the meaning is completely different and only the second one will manifest while the first one is just me thinking. It's like thinking "I will scratch my itch" but then refusing to move my arms. It's just a thought. It doesn't scratch anything by itself. But if I focused on the idea of my itch vanishing and I was serious and fully expected this to become viscerally realized with good justification (such as having subjective idealism as my worldview in addition to also using intent in that way), then my itch my indeed vanish. So I completely agree. You're pointing out a very important distinction, which is also subtle and can be easy to miss.

> [[**syncretik**: As mindseal put it in our discussion "sometimes you may (optionally) want to deliberately limit your ability to decide if you notice you tend to decide haphazardly and carelessly at times (sometimes it only takes one bad decision to ruin something important), you may want to put a conceptual magickal "wall" between decisions and emanation so that only especially empowered decisions are allowed to affect something more than the body and the personal conscious mind."
>
> I have had a few instant manifestations when I felt completely comfortable and sure about what I wanted without any doubts or hesitations. In the context of a 'human in a physical world' as it exists at this time, stability is important for you otherwise life would appear to be chaotic. So instant manifestation doesn't occur in your reality because you might find it unsettling. You have to commit to and be comfortable with the idea that instant manifestation is possible and doesn't have to abide by the laws of science or the rules of society.
>
> For example if you want to manifest money you will have all sorts of qualms and beliefs about money, such as how it will come about and from where, the amount of work you will have to do to earn it, how long it takes to get paid and so on. This is the knowledge you're conscious of and comfortable with in regards to money and so that's the way you have to go about manifesting it. Whereas finding a big wad of cash at your door is a much more novel and unsettling idea, and it's definitely not in alignment with your beliefs.

Doubts and beliefs are the hindrances, so firstly you let go of the hindering beliefs, then you *decide* or *will* what the new reality is.

“Does frequency/vibration (example feeling good) even matter when manifesting or is it just pure will?”; **Your will overrides everything.** If you believe that emotions/frequency/vibrations are important then you will be relying on those things and they will become relevant, but they don't have to be. It will make more sense when you understand what it means to *decide* instead of hope and wait. When you decide to get a glass of water you don't rely on emotions or vibrations, you simply get up and get a glass of water. You *know* that water is already there and you only have to reach for it. "Deciding" and "knowing" are learned habits of confidence which you can develop over time, little by little like learning a musical instrument or any other skill.]]

mindseal – Reply to: Thinking From

I think Neville Goddard has said a lot of interesting things. This is one of them. I don't know if I would take it totally literally or not, because there are examples where we don't need this thinking. For example, any time I anticipate an outcome that I *know* is within my reach, I can think toward it and this is just fine. For example, I am going to get some coffee. I'm not thinking I already have it. I think I am going to get it. But this one is OK, because I have no doubt whatsoever that I'll get it and I just get it as a matter of course with complete confidence. On the other hand, I think what Neville talks about becomes much more important when it comes to, for example, one's own fundamental and most basic identity. So for example, in an ultimate sense one is either God or isn't, and there is no way to gradually acquire Godliness if it isn't already available. There is a similar saying in Zen Buddhism where they recommend to start with enlightenment instead of trying to work one's way up to it. Another example would be freedom of will. If someone assumes they don't have freedom of will, there is no way to gradually go from this commitment to one where one has freedom of will.

So in order for amazing transformations to be able to work, one has to have really powerful axioms and one has to constantly think *from* those axioms. So in this sense I certainly agree with Neville, because there are some things I just don't think one can think toward. Some things must simply be assumed at the outset or there is no other way to enter into the mental state of those things. I think specifically when it comes to the fundamental parameter's of one's ability, if anyone wants to have powerful operating parameters, those must simply be assumed to already exist. So for example, if one wants omnipotent functioning, omnipotence should be assumed axiomatically, because something less than omnipotent cannot become omnipotent.

Capabilities either exist or they do not. They cannot be developed. Capabilities can be forgotten. Capabilities can become unused. I'm talking about capabilities in the most primal sense. Of course even with the best assumption, due to the patterns imposed by old commitments and habits some practice may be required. So if in a fundamental sense I may be capable of lifting say 2000lbs using this body, I might need to practice first. But there is no sense to even *begin* practicing if I believe such a thing is not within my abilities on a fundamental level.

As for the specific outcomes, as opposed to fundamental abilities, that's a gray area I think. Part of the problem here is, what happens if someone assumes something is already the case, but it doesn't manifest? It's important not to enter into a brittle state of mind. It seems if one is too insistent on a result too quickly, the potential for disappointment and the subsequent giving up becomes great. So if I assume the wall is already air and I try to walk trough it and fail, then what happens? I might just give up. I might become disheartened. This state of mind is brittle and impatient. To really walk through a wall I'd have to contemplate all the meanings of my experience extremely thoroughly to the point where such an event would make sense, would fit into the rest of my life easily, it would fit into all else I know about life, and contemplate to the point where I'd be comfortable with it at an emotional level too. So my intellect and emotions have to match what I want to be able to do, and this kind of change may not always be trivial, depending on how radical my vision is. And then to never give up is really great as well. After all, never giving up is very important for cultivating unbending resolve, which is a very important quality of will for manifestation. Unbending resolve can also be phrased as "constancy to purpose."

So all in all I think what Neville says is totally worth considering and worth using whenever possible, but watch out that the mindset does not accidentally become brittle. The mindset should ideally be resilient, adaptable when necessary, resolute. This kind of mindset should be able to rest or pause easily without thinking it has retreated or given up.

Contemplation is still the most important activity, because one should integrate whatever abilities one wants to have into one's own understanding of everything and develop not just intellectual but also emotional acceptance that this new way of life is totally OK, totally acceptable and worth it, and so on. From this POV, simply thinking you're already at an end point, if not used skilfully, may be a bit like trying to brute force the situation without thinking carefully about *why* is it that right now some things seem difficult to do/experience. This is another possible danger.

I think it's possible to use Neville's advice without any notion that one is brute forcing anything and use it in a way that will help rather than discourage contemplation. But the danger exists that this method tries to jump to the end result a bit too quickly to the point where it may even prevent the person from thinking *why* the present undesirably over-limited situation is the way it is, understanding which is very important.

> [Q: Thank you for the in-depth response. You raise some great points! It's a great idea to use this for foundational stuff. Also, you make great note about assuming being more binary, not a 'gradual' process. You want to assume the whole state, not the 'getting there'. I keep forgetting this! Lastly, You're right about it not being necessary for something like a coffee. In that case, I *have* been looking for the operative principle, the common denominator in all my rather unintentional 'successes'. It seems to be detachment / letting go. Which would account for the coffee! (In fact, 'thinking from' could just be seen as just another method of letting go, how much do you fuss over something you already have?). Even more, in most of those cases, I didn't even 'do' anything, except want or intend for something, and then give up on it. Which turns this into a thread about how to do that in a deliberate, targeted way, on a per-outcome basis.]

I'm afraid the stuff you bring up is very non-trivial to discuss.

For example, I've trained my vision in the past (and still train it a tiny bit here and there) and here's what I've found for me. I've discovered firstly that I have something I refer to as "visual habit." It's the way my mind goes about to see things and when seeing things. In my specific case I have found two flaws in my visual habit (or three, if you count physicalism).

One flaw is that I tend to drill with my eyes (not literally of course, this is a subtle mental process I am trying to describe). It's like I am trying to reach out to objects 'out there' because by habit I believe they're outside, far away. This produces strain. Like when my eyes are open and I am looking around, there is a subtle strain, a subtle desire to want to get closer, and feeling like everything is too far away and I have to reach out to it, which I then compensate by drilling with my eyes, or reaching with my eyes, instead of just allowing the imagery to coalesce of "its own" accord. So there is a conception of separation involved here, I am here, and the stuff I want to see is out there. That's the separation. And there is a lot more to it.

Like all my ideas about eyeballs and how I believe eyeballs work and what I expect from eyeballs and so on. All this can be termed "my physicalist hangover." It means while I don't really believe in physicalism anymore, but by habit, there is mental activity that corresponds to this old belief. This activity can be extremely subtle so that I might even retain some of the old physicalistic expectations unknowingly. So for example, if I believe

something is "physically" wrong with my eyeball, I then have a reason to think that seeing properly is "just impossible."

And another very important thing is my disinterest. I noticed that when I see things, I don't take interest in them. For example, if I see a tree, I don't dwell on the subtleties of the textures and shades and so on, I just note it as "a tree" and move on. And it's like that isn't just with a tree. It's like this with almost every visual object and there are deep reasons for this. This isn't accidental or arbitrary. So when I look I have a low degree of interest in what I see. Part of the reason for this is because I put so much emphasis on my inner world, but that's not the whole story.

So when I train my vision I have to correct all these habits. Then my vision improves.

So habit 1 is corrected by the idea that what I see is not the world but my own will. Since what I observe is the state of my own volition, I don't have to reach out. Everything I need to see anything is available without any attempt to reach across some space.

Habit 2 is corrected by constantly contemplating the superiority of subjective idealism and the shittiness of physicalism. Obviously this one is by no means a fast process. Switching my underlying metaphysics is a life long effort for me, because it means I change more or less everything about what I used to think was true.

Habit 3 is addressed by taking more interest in what I see and by developing curiosity and attentiveness, but to make this one stick, I'd have to develop this into a habit instead of just being curious for 5 minutes and then going back to my old ways.

OK, so do you see how in this kind of manifestation there is no talk of letting go, no talk of assuming any final state, etc. This is completely different in almost every way from what Neville talks about.

That's because to a large extent advice like "live from your dreams" is a generic advice. It's a hint. What to *actually* do is still something we have to figure out for ourselves. I seriously don't think it's possible to take any single advice and just implement it as a rote thing and have it work. That's not how it works in the mind. This may work with something really simple, like for example, before putting your shoes on, use a shoehorn. That's something you can just start doing immediately by rote, and every time from then on it will be easier to put your shoes on, cause now you use a shoehorn. But manifestation is not like putting one's shoes on. It's not whatsoever simple like that. Manifestation involves all that we believe, want, fear, various strange personal peculiarities, habits old and new, commitments old and new, etc. Plus all this is structured using concepts and the mental structures are incredibly involved at times and worse, they're not even guaranteed to be the same from person to person. So for example, if I learn how to levitate in the air, my advice might be completely inapplicable or even backward for you, because the peculiarities that prevent flying for you might be very different from those I had to overcome to fly. I think the best we can do here is discuss subjective idealism and the core principles, but when it comes to details, people have to take responsibility and begin digging inside their own minds for answers. Of course by chance some people might share some of the specifics and it might sometimes be worth discussing those as well, but it can also be very misleading, because there is no guarantee, as I see it, why my hangups have to be shared by everyone else. So if I had to overcome this and that hangup, it doesn't mean everyone else has to also overcome the same.

With regard to manifestation there are roughly two levels of it. One level is the world, and the other level is what you do in the world. So when you manifest your own world, this already includes ideas about what you

think should be possible in that world. Your world can have built-in limitations, on purpose, so that you can make sense of it, or for any other reasons. I would even say if your world has no limitations then it's not a world at all. A world has to have some regions, some stability, some repeatability. If there is a world you should be able to return to an old place you used to visit. That's both stability and repeatability. You're able to repeat a rough copy of an old experience. So for example, you can visit NYC many times, and while NYC will change each time, it will have some recognizable features that did not change and that will still give it a believable NYC character. Then in the world you can move around by relying on your body and do other things, perhaps without relying on your body, if you know how.

So something like moving your arm around is trivial and it fits into your idea of the world very neatly. On the other hand, if you want to grow a third arm from your body's backside and learn to use that third arm, that's not even slightly trivial. That conflicts with your ideas about humanity, about inheritance (as in, your mother and father didn't have a 3rd arm, etc.), about your own mind and body interaction and so on. So something that massively "violates" a plethora of commitments, habits, is not simple. It's not that it is inherently complex and complicated, no, but it's complex and complicated because your old commitments and habits are there for a reason, and because those old mental patterns have huge surface areas, lots of structures, lots of moving parts, relationships, inter-dependencies, etc. You put these mental structures there for a reason (even if it's a dumb reason, it's still a reason, meaning, it's not arbitrary but fulfills some kind of need for you). You cannot simultaneously go forward and backward. Choices have opportunity costs.

So roughly speaking there is quick manifestation and long range manifestation. Long range manifestation is changing what you want to be able to do in general. So for example, if you want, say, flying to become a regular ability for you, that's a long range manifestation project. But then flying here and flying there is a quick manifestation because it simply replicates something you already assume you can do, which has been made possible via long range manifestation. So in other words, you cannot just assume you can fly. First you would have to assume you can fly but then you have to work with all your mentality to bring it in line with that idea in every possible way. That's a massive project. It's basically like world building. You're building a world where flying is possible, and you're carving this world out of your own will. Once you're done carving it, then flying is not hard.

This is also comparable to say making a tea cup, which is hard, and then using that tea cup over and over to store water, which is easy. So you'd spend hours carving wood or shaping clay and firing your clay cup in an oven, and then filling it with water is only seconds and very easy, so long as you keep your cup. You're making a reusable pattern basically. So if you think the world is a pattern, first some space has to be opened up in that pattern to make room for new reusable patterns. Then those new reusable patterns have to be cultivated. Then you could use those new patterns on a whim. All this takes place entirely nowhere else but inside your own will. It's all inside your mind, inside your private perspective.

There is more to say about it, but this I think is already way over the top. This is something that a person has to realize for themselves. Specifically *why* does the world seem so limited? And is that always a bad thing or does this have some upsides? How does it really work? How can limitation be tweaked? When those limitations are tweaked, is that a long term thing or short term? In other words, if I cancel the ability of a wall to hold me back, am I cancelling it just this once, or is it the case that from now on all the walls have subtly (or not so subtly) less ability to hold me back? The answer is, it depends. It all depends on what I intend.

mindseal – Reply to: Still Experiencing a Human; I Hope You're Not Lost

Mundanity can sometimes make me temporarily overlook what I know, but not much and not for long.

It's spiritually dangerous, I think, to compare oneself to someone else. Setting aside the fact that there is no way to know where one subjectivity is relative another, even if you did know something like that, how would it help? It would only continue taking you outside your own perspective instead of allowing you to master your own perspective. Of course conventional mentality is to know oneself through what one imagines "the other" knows about oneself, which is the socially constructed identity of "I am who I *and the others* say I am." I can have a socially constructed identity for myself even inside my own dream. It's basically like playing a certain kind of game with myself.

As I see it, in order not to get lost, you'd have to shift your center of spiritual (intellectual + emotional) gravity into yourself first and the sense then would be that you live inside yourself and what you'd refer to as "the universe" also lives inside you as your dream. You'd have to take yourself as the center and live like that in a lifestyle where all the life "things" come out and go back to you at all times. So you're not the one who goes out (into the world) and comes back (into your home away from the world). You're staying. You're stationary. You're the eternal place. The world comes in and out. When the world comes in, it's your guest. When the world goes out, you're the absolute sovereign of your own solitude. This must be an unbending commitment such that even if you don't think about it, you feel like it's true all the time such that if someone asks you about it, you'd say, "yea, that's right, that's how it is, it is true."

Then even if you do things which some might consider mundane, you'll never ever become mundane yourself. The things of the world will never confuse you once you start living inside yourself instead of inside a universe of some sort. Let the universe live in you. But, I also think it's a slow process and it cannot be rushed because one has to enter into this process in a sincere and genuine way, which can only happen subjectively whenever one is ready. In any case, I don't think it helps to freak out, as long as you know what it is you value. If you get confused about your value ladder, what is most important in your life and what is less important, then there might be some trouble. As long as you know you value this beyond-conventional truth of your own being above all else, how can there be anything bigger than simply the smallest possible degree of confusion?

Your will is the law, ultimately. If you know what you're about, all else is certain and the way is broad and stable. And the cool thing is, no one knows if you know what you're about. So if you say you know what you're about I just have to take your word for it, if I want to trust you. If I don't want to trust you, you cannot prove it to me. The point is, it's something sacred between you and you and no one can stick their nose in that for you. Even if you solicit advice, it is still only up to you to determine which meaning fits where inside your own mindset. So even if you solicited advice, even then, no one could stick their nose into your mindset. People always have to be either consciously or unconsciously invited in to participate. So once you grab hold of your secrets, everything becomes secure and simple. You can rest inside yourself with confidence so that if you do anything, it is done well, and if you avoid doing, you rest well. That's excellence in both action and rest. What else is there? This kind of excellence only you can know. Once you know it, you cannot verify it.

> Q: To be clear, at no point during this whole experience did I ever lose any fundamental knowledge or vital wisdom. You could have grabbed me at any random and mundane moment and barked, "What is the nature of reality?" Or, "Who are you?" and my answer would've been no different than my answer right now. Instead, I simply carry on with my human life as though I don't know any of that.

It's a matter of habit and utility. I think having some practice may help here to change the habit. I either cast spells or honor and remember the old spells in a mini-ritual nearly daily. I also rest the body in healing attention and intention with and without the "fancy" visualizations. So with habits like that, there is no way for me to act "normal." On the other hand, even these activities can also become normal. Normality is not something that one should be inherently scared of.

Basically it comes down to: am I living a life I want to live? If not, can I add whatever is missing right now? If not, can I take one step in that direction? If not, why not? Usually I can at least take a step. If for some reason I didn't know what step to take, I'd contemplate what my step could be and figure it out.

In general resting in many kinds of different mental states or using them in a more active manner is something that happens often as a matter of habit and life utility. So for example, if something itches or I feel some slight pain, I know what to do. If I want some circumstance to lean a certain way, I know what to do. I can eat my food as "normal" or I can "bless" it first before eating it. I can poop on the pot as normal, or I can take that time to relax the body deeper than would have been normal. I can take a shower as usual, or I can use the healing water visualization. There are countless such opportunities.

mindseal – Reply to: Still experiencing a human; only moderately lost.

> Q: So that's the challenge. Find a way to exist that isn't untenable but which also allows space - the bulk of the space - for mental progress.

That's why people in the past have established monk and nun orders, and I believe there are even some non-denominational meditation retreats which are not free (although maybe even some free or donation-based ones exist?). I've heard people raving about Goenka retreats but those are not long term stays, even if from what I remember they're free or donation based (but don't take my word for it). I've also heard of people leaving to live in an ashram, which is a similar idea to becoming a monk or a nun.

Well, in my ideal world we will all be receiving universal basic income, or at least have access to plenty of commons land, so that you could live off the land without paying a dime for anything. Then you'd only need labor to make you a hut and hunt/fish/gather. This lifestyle is very similar to some Daoist hermits I've read about. Some people still figure out ways to live this way today. Like there was a dude that lived in a tunnel he carved with the hammers by himself in the side of a mountain off some freeway in some low population state. There was a video about it on youtube. I'm not sure if he had any property rights to do that, but whatever, he just did it, and he even rented a section of his self-made cave to some curious tourists which then paid for more tools and some other resources, and the locals thought of this dude as a curiosity and would support him in various small ways from time to time, from what I gathered. I don't think that kind of stuff is for me, but I keep it in the back of my mind, "just in case."

> Q: Less wishy-washiness: If you want to do magic, do magic. Don't beat around the bush, generate some intentions, set parameters, make things happen, judge your results!

I do that fairly regularly. It's become somewhat habitual, but not habitual enough yet. I still have some minor lapses when I forget I could be engaging in magic but don't. One thing I got good at remembering and making habitual is a kind of healing body meditation. I submerge my body inside an imaginary cocoon of softness and warmth and it has great effects. I do this before falling asleep or when reditting (but not right during posting something), so if I am reading something and I don't have to actively think about what to type next, I can shift a percentage of my attention to this cocoon business, or I can just lean back in this chair here and take a break and that also works.

Healing I suppose is not as fancy as the other kinds of magic, but it's damn useful though, and it produces fairly obvious results inside the body, fairly quickly and consistently, which means I am much more likely to do it.

> Q: The challenge here is walking the tightrope of not sinking into despair or giving up when you fail.

Yup. :)

> Q: Floating brain: I'm almost embarrassed to include this one, but I've found that it's effective at tackling the sensation that you're located in a brain, experiencing the world from behind a set of eyeballs, especially when you don't have much mental energy for genuine deconstruction of the world. Take your brain, make it transparent, float it in front of you. This helps me to remember that the brain is a construct of the mind, like the world, not the centre/originating point of my consciousness. It also gives me a sense of omnipresence.

Nice! :) I like this one. Thank you.

I also like to "position" myself somewhat behind my body instead of right behind my eyeballs. I don't like being inside my head too much, although I don't hate it, to be honest. I think being inside the head is not so bad, so long as there are other options available that I can exercise. But being too much inside the head can accidentally lead to a build up of pressure in the head, at least for me. It pretty much never happens to me, but it used to a long time go. I'd have to consciously focus my attention deep into the earth below to rid myself of that uncomfortable pressure, but since I don't dwell inside my head all that much anymore and I am not as serious about being in my head even when I am behind my eyeballs for a time, I don't get any problems with pressure.

>Q: So anyway. Long story short, do not go gentle into that good night, rage, rage against the dying of the light, etc.

Great poem! :)

> Q: Have you given any retreats a go?

No. I used to dream about it but then I realized I am almost always in quasi-retreat anyway, why do I need to go somewhere else?

Early in life I also thought I had to do a lot of sitting meditation, except I didn't like sitting, but I was always walking. Then I realized instead of dreaming about sitting I should take walking as my meditation. Once I did that, I wasn't postponing anything anymore. That was a big step forward for me: to make my mind training fit me as a person instead of making myself fit into some externally conceived idea of mind training.Actually no longer slavishly and deferentially listening to the gurus and traditional advice was the best thing I'd ever done for myself, because I started moving forward very rapidly once I became my own authority.

Not long after I realized I should stop dreaming about sitting and accept walking as my meditation, I decided that every second of every day is practice, is suitable for training my mind, and so I took all of my life as mind training. Then I really boosted ahead after that and never looked back. I discarded any and all kinds of romanticism I had about formal practice, altars, teachers, groups, etc., and started really paying attention to my own mind every second of every day.

So for me I no longer have any kind of romantic ideas about retreats. But at the same time I recognize that so many others will benefit from those and I don't instantly assume everyone else is just like me. I've read many reports from people who were very happy during and after these retreats.

Part of training for me is to no longer be impressed by appearances. So if suppose I was exposed to a vision of a cubicle farm, I wouldn't let that vision impress me in the same way a regular person would be. Since it

wouldn't weigh me down in the same way, I could practice even then and there. And I would always make satisfying myself a higher priority than satisfying my boss, unless my boss lived and died for my benefit or something, in which case I might consider reciprocating, but that would be strange.

My point is: **everything in your life is for you, for your benefit, and is your training ground and your training resource. You can do whatever you want and train at any time.**

Tibetans talk about this as "taking obstacles as the path." So your ostensibly worldly life appears as an obstacle that you seemingly need to get away from, right? Instead, take it as your path. Alchemically transform lead into gold. Transform your ordinary life into a training ground with great opportunities for yourself. You have to assign to yourself more authority for your life to do this right. Stop feeling like you owe something to others unless you feel they go through *their* life like they *owe you*, in which case you're reciprocating. If you look around and you realize no one behaves in a way suggesting that they're beholden to you, then where would your attitude of trying to serve them and live up to their expectation come from?

These visions of other people and your own expectation about their expectations of you is a heavy brick in your mind. Dump it. Convert everything in your life into your own private mind training, and do it in a way that is wise and skillful and avoid any unnecessary recklessness, but taking intelligent risks is a good idea. That's what I recommend, if you find yourself always thinking about retreats and better conditions, which seemingly never arrive. But at the same time, if you're the kind of person who can arrange such trips, you may enjoy them too, and a formally structured meditation retreat can also produce benefits that are great.

> Q: I've often thought that a monk/nun order would be great, with the big caveat that you didn't fall into the trap of creating the perfect monk or nun order (I can see myself getting distracted by this) and forgetting to pursue the thing that made you set the order up in the first place.

I couldn't agree more. This is a big reason why I don't like the idea of starting a religion or something. I just want to train myself.

> Q: Yes! I think I experience something similar. A kind of "compressed" feeling. Usually I feel I need to sit down and visualise galaxies and infinite vistas when it becomes too pressing.

Interesting. I tried your crystal brain visualization the other day and it was interesting. I definitely felt something.

> Q: One thing that's heartening is that once the SI seed is planted, it's pretty tenacious, in spite of adversity. It may not grow quickly but it's not uprooted easily either.

Ah, you've said this so well. :) I could not agree more. It's as you say. It's a way of life. A way of thinking.

Once seen, it would be hard to unsee.

Reality exists in the human mind.



FD